

3 1761 08154592 3



JOURNAL OF THE SOCIETY
OF
BIBLICAL LITERATURE
AND
EXEGESIS,
242 C CONTAINING
PAPERS AND PROCEEDINGS

FOR
JUNE AND DECEMBER, 1883. - 1884

*The authors alone are responsible for the contents
of their papers.*

PUBLISHED FOR THE SOCIETY
BY THE SECRETARY, H. G. MITCHELL,
12 SOMERSET ST., BOSTON, MASS.

Price to Subscribers, \$3.00.



BS
410
J7
v.3-4

CONTENTS.

908782 -

June.

	PAGE.
THE ARGUMENT E SILENTIO	3
PROF. C. A. BRIGGS, D.D.	
ROMANS IX.-XI.	22
PROF. E. P. GOULD.	
THE HISTORICAL TESTIMONY OF THE PROPHET ZEPHANIAH .	42
PROF. HENRY FERGUSON.	
NOTES	60
<i>Modern Chapters and Verses. — Αἰώνιος II. Cor. iv. 17 and v. 1. — Matt. xii. 43-45.</i>	
PROCEEDINGS	63

December.

THE INDEPENDENT LEGISLATION OF DEUTERONOMY . . .	67
PROF. E. C. BISSELL, D.D.	
RECENT DISCUSSIONS OF ROM. IX. 5	90
PROF. EZRA ABBOT, D.D., LL.D.	
THE READINGS Ἑλληνας AND Ἑλληνοιστάς ACTS XI. 20 .	113
PROF. B. B. WARFIELD, D.D.	
ÆNON NEAR TO SALIM	128
PROF. WM. ARNOLD STEVENS.	
THE SYRIAC MANUSCRIPT OF THE UNION THEOLOGICAL SEM- INARY OF NEW YORK	142
PROF. ISAAC H. HALL, PH.D.	
NOTES	153
<i>Luke xxiv. 32 in Syriac. — Job xix. 25-27. — Correc- tions.</i>	
PROCEEDINGS	156
LIST OF MEMBERS	158

JUNE.

The Argument E Silentio,

With Special Reference to the Religion of Israel.

BY PROF. C. A. BRIGGS, D.D.

THE Argument from Silence is frequently used on all sides, and yet there is general distrust as to its validity. This is certainly an unsatisfactory state of affairs. If the argument be invalid, scholars ought to abandon it. If, however, it be valid, its validity should be clearly established and generally recognized. The uncertainty as to this argument is due to a lack of consideration of the merits of the question and the absence of discriminating definitions. From a sense of the need of such definitions in our own studies, we propose to beat our way into this difficult investigation, in hope that others will correct our mistakes, and improve upon our results. We are assured with Robert Boyle (*Some Considerations touching the Style of the H. Scriptures*, Lond., 1661, p. 111), "There is such a fulnesse in that book that oftentimes it sayes much by saying nothing; and not only its expressions, but its silences are teaching, like a Dyall, in which the shadow as well as the light informs us."

(1) *Silence is, in many cases, a lack of evidence, for the reason that the matter in question did not come within the scope of the author's argument.* To determine whether this be so or not, may not always be easy, but it is a necessary preliminary to any use of the argument from silence. We must first determine exactly what the author does say in its organic connection, together with the design and the scope of his argument, before we can draw any safe conclusions with regard to that which lies outside of his limits, and the silence that he maintains with respect to the matters of our inquiry. Thus, in the question as to the "men of the Great Synagogue," it is argued by many

critics, — such as Budde, Kuenen, Robertson Smith, and others, — that the Great Synagogue had no real existence, but was a fiction of Talmudic writers. In the discussion of the subject, attention is called to the silence of Josephus, Philo, the Apocalypse of Ezra, I. Maccabees, and the Apocryphal literature generally, as to any such body. Prof. Wright, in his *Book of Koheleth*, Lond., 1883, pp. 7 sq., says: "The silence of the Apocryphal books as well as of Josephus and Philo, with respect to 'the men of the Great Synagogue,' is neither strange nor remarkable. It is well known that the Jewish annals, from the death of Nehemiah (circa 415 B.C.) down to B.C. 175, are almost a complete blank. The writers of the Apocryphal books had no occasion at all to refer to the acts of 'the men of the Great Synagogue,' and Josephus appears to have been almost totally devoid of information with respect to the Jewish annals during the period referred to. That writer has, indeed, been clever enough to prevent this gap in his history from being perceived by ordinary readers. Although he may have been fully aware of the existence of such a body as 'the men of the Great Synagogue,' and may have often heard of the difficulties which that body felt with respect to certain books of the Canon, such facts were scarcely those which Josephus would have cared to record in his *Antiquities*, when he had no further incidents to adduce which bore on the history of the period in question. In writing against Apion, Josephus had every reason to pass over such facts in silence. His silence, too, is not so inexcusable; as the facts known, while not really opposed to the conclusion at which he arrived, would readily have placed convenient weapons in the hands of an unscrupulous antagonist" (pp. 7-8). Here we have several explanations of the argument from silence, *e.g.*, it was beyond the scope of the Apocryphal books; it was owing to ignorance in part, and in part to intention and policy in the case of Josephus. And yet our author, on p. 476, says: "But little weight is to be assigned to the silence of Josephus, as such a point scarcely comes within the scope of his history." We would ask of Dr. Wright which of the two positions he means to hold against Kuenen. If he hold as on p. 476, that the mention of "the men of the Great Synagogue" was without the scope of Josephus, then he cannot maintain that the silence was owing to ignorance, or partial knowledge, or policy in argument, or to prevent the reader of his history from knowing the disputes about the Canon among the Jews. Prof. Kuenen notes that I. Maccabees xiv. 28 speaks of "a great assembly of the priests and people and rulers of the nation and elders of the land," and yet is silent as to "the men of the Great Synagogue."

The latter would seem to have been within the writer's scope as well as the former. The whole question, then, depends upon the first inquiry whether the mention of "the men of the Great Synagogue," if such a body existed, fairly came within the scope of these writers. This must be tested in every case ere a valid argument can be made.

We shall now mention a few cases in which, as it seems to us, certain things were beyond the scope of the writers. Thus, in the Book of Esther, there is no mention of the divine Name, and no conception of divine Providence. This seems, at the first glance, very strange. The history of Esther would be as fitting to illustrate divine Providence as the story of Joseph. We should expect that the divine names would have been frequently in the mouths of the heroes of the story. And yet, on closer examination, it appears that the Book of Esther was written with a very different purpose from the story of Joseph. It was the work of a patriotic Jew who wished to give the origin of the Feast of Purim, and enforce fidelity to Jewish nationality. The author's scope was political rather than religious, doctrinal, or ethical. Hence, while the name of the Persian monarch appears 187 times, the name of God does not occur. Persian decrees, and the fidelity of Esther to her nation, and skill in overcoming the intrigues of its enemies, take the place of the divine Providence. The same is true in the Song of Songs. Its scope is entirely ethical, to show the victory of marital love over all the seductions that may be employed to constrain it toward others than the rightful object of it. The author had no occasion to use the divine Name, or to speak of religious themes. In the prophets Joel, Hosea, and Ezekiel, there is no reference to the doctrine of Creation. The plan of these prophets, and the scope of their argument, lie in other directions. There is no reference to the doctrines of a future life in the prophets Amos, Joel, Jeremiah, Nahum, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi. While it is not so clear in these cases that this subject was beyond their scope, yet we do not see that it was in the path of their writings in such a manner that they would have been obliged to mention it. There is no Messianic prophecy in the Wisdom Literature, *e.g.*, Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs. These writings are ethical, and the Messianic idea was clearly beyond their scope.

Other instances might be added, but these are sufficient for the establishment of our first proposition. They show that silence in many cases is to be explained from the reason that the matter was beyond the scope of the writer's argument.

(2) *Silence is concurrent testimony where the matter would have*

been within the author's scope under certain circumstances. That there is silence is an evidence that these circumstances do not exist. This argument is on the well-known popular principle that silence gives consent. If there were evidence to the contrary, it would certainly have been produced. A fine example of this argument is given by Bishop Lightfoot in his review of the author of "*Supernatural Religion*," in the *Contemporary Review*, xxv. 183, in treating of the silence of Eusebius. He quotes from Eusebius, *H. E.*, iii. 3, to the effect that his design was to give (1) the references or testimonies in the case of disputed writings of the Canon only; (2) the records of anecdotes in the case of the acknowledged and disputed writings alike. If the Gospel of John had been a disputed writing, he would have given references and testimonies according to his first principle. He does not do this, therefore, "The silence of Eusebius respecting early witnesses to the Fourth Gospel is an evidence in its favor." Its apostolic authorship had never been questioned by any church writer from the beginning, so far as Eusebius was aware, and therefore it was superfluous to call witnesses.

(3) *Silence is sometimes designed by the authors for good and sufficient reasons, which may be ascertained; silence then proves a valid argument in accordance with the nature of the reasons.*

In these cases, the matter came within the author's scope, and his silence may be shown to be intentional. This argument from silence has been the one most commonly employed. Thus Warburton, in his *Divine Legation of Moses Vindicated*, Lond., 1837, vol. ii. p. 531, argues, "If religion be necessary to civil government, and if religion cannot subsist under the common dispensation of Providence without a future state of rewards and punishments, so consummate a law-giver would never have neglected to inculcate the belief of such a state, had he not been well assured that an extraordinary Providence was indeed to be administered over his people." This argument has been often disputed. Both premises have been called in question. There can be no doubt that the idea that "religion cannot subsist under the common dispensation of Providence, without a future state of rewards and punishments," rests on too narrow an induction of the religions of the world. There can be no doubt that Warburton is disposed to minimize the Old Testament statements as to the future life, and yet it seems to us that he is certainly correct in his statement that the Pentateuchal codes are silent as to a future state of rewards and punishments, and that this silence was designed. Warburton calls attention justly to Moses' familiarity with the Egyptian

religion and its highly-developed Eschatology. We have now abundant evidence to show that the Babylonian and Shemitic religions, with which the patriarchal ancestors were first brought in contact, were full and elaborate on this subject. The silence of these codes was designed. We are not convinced that this silence is to be explained altogether on the principle that the Hebrew government was a theocracy of extraordinary Providence ; yet we are sure that it was the design of the Pentateuchal religion to emphasize life in the Holy Land under the divine instruction, and to ignore the future state of rewards and punishments on that account. The essential thing was the divine blessing in life, and the most dreaded thing was the divine curse in life. Indeed, it is the great lesson of Biblical Eschatology that the future life depends upon man's relation to God in this life. It is an evidence of great weakness in any religion to show extreme anxiety as to the future life. This was the worst feature in the Egyptian religion. The study of Biblical Eschatology, in its development in the Scriptures, makes it evident that in the entire course of Biblical history the other religions with which the Biblical religion was brought in contact were more elaborate in Eschatology than the Biblical religion. We also believe it to be a fact that the Eschatology of the Christian Church has derived its material very largely from other religions than the religion of the Old and New Covenants. Biblical Eschatology is much simpler than the Eschatology that has prevailed in the Christian Church. There can be no doubt therefore that the silence of the Pentateuch as to a future state of rewards and punishments was designed in order that the people of Israel might devote themselves entirely to the doing of the divine will in this life, and thereby receive the blessing or the curse in accordance with their deserts.

Archbishop Whately also uses the argument from silence from this point of view in his *Essays on Some of the Peculiarities of the Christian Religion*, 5th ed., Lond., 1846, Essay vii., and in his *Kingdom of Christ*, N.Y., 1859, p. 28 sq. He calls attention to the fact that "No such thing is to be found in our Scriptures as a Catechism or regular Elementary Introduction to the Christian Religion ; nor do they furnish us with anything of the nature of a systematic Creed, — set of Articles, — Confession of Faith, or by whatever other name we may designate a regular, complete Compendium of Christian doctrines. Nor again do they supply us with a Liturgy for ordinary Public Worship, or with forms of administering the Sacraments, or of conferring Holy Orders ; nor do they even give any precise directions

as to these and other ecclesiastical matters ; anything that at all corresponds to a Rubric or set of Canons. And this omission is, as I have said, of a widely different character from the one before mentioned, since all these are things of manifestly practical utility, and by no means calculated to gratify mere idle curiosity" (Essays, p. 331, 332). He then argues that "since no one of the first promulgators of Christianity did that which they must, some of them, at least, have been naturally led to do, it follows that they must have been supernaturally withheld from it" (p. 349). "Each Church, therefore, was left, through the wise foresight of Him who alone 'knew what is in man,' to provide for its own wants as they should arise ; to steer its own course by the Chart and Compass which His Holy Word supplies, regulating for itself the Sails and Rudder according to the winds and currents it may meet with" (p. 355). "It is very important therefore, and, to a diligent and reflective and unprejudiced reader, not difficult, by observing what the sacred writers have omitted and what they have mentioned, and in what manner they have mentioned, each, to form in his mind distinctly the three classes just alluded to, viz., First, of things essential to Christianity and enjoined as universally requisite ; secondly, those left to the discretion of the governors of each Church ; thirdly, those excluded as inconsistent with the Character of the Gospel Religion" (*Kingdom of Christ*, p. 34). This silence or reserve of divine Revelation is extended by Dr. Wharton (*Silence of Scripture*, Boston, 1867) so as to cover many things that we should like to know, as to the Creation of the World, the origin of evil, divination, the Virgin Mary, the personal appearance of Christ, as well as liturgy and creeds dwelt upon by Whately. Robert Hall has a fine sermon on "The Glory of God in Concealing" (*Works*, N.Y., 1857, iii. p. 310 sq.). Trench, in his *Hulsean Lectures*, 1845, Lecture vi., "On the Fitness of Holy Scripture," Phila., 1851, p. 120 sq., alludes to the same truth of the intentional silence or reserve of divine Revelation. We might illustrate this form of argument from silence from the human point of view of the Biblical authors rather than the point of view of the divine Author of Scripture, but it will come up incidentally under the next head, and we would save our space.

(4) *Silence is often evidence of the ignorance of the author on the point in question.* Here, again, it must be proved that the matter was clearly within the scope of his argument. This phase of the argument from silence is vastly important ; upon it depends the Science of History. Of what possible use are historic records, unless they give

us information that we could not otherwise know? How can we trace the progress of events or opinions, except on the presumption that whatever occurs leaves its record, and whatever is known is in some way made known.

Where there is silence, we may assume ignorance as to the matter in question, and even find positive disproof of its existence. An event or an opinion might not be known to a particular person, or might be known to but a few, and these might perish. But it is to be presumed that those to whom the event or knowledge was known would make it known if it were within the scope of their argument. We prove the growth of knowledge from the silence of early writers and the statements of later writers. The statement of opinions give us the basis for the history of the opinions. Silence is an evidence of ignorance of them. Thus, Dr. Mombert (*Handbook of the English Versions of the Bible*, N.Y., 1883, p. 107 sq.) overcomes the tradition, handed down from Fox, and apparently supported by the Colophon of Tyndale's first edition of his translation of Genesis, "emprinted at Marlborow in the land of Hesse, by me, Hans Luft, &c.," that Tyndale was a student at Marburg, and went from thence to Hamburg by way of Antwerp, to meet Coverdale in 1529; by showing that there is no record at Marburg of Hans Luft ever having set up a printing press there, and that the Album of the University does not contain Tyndale's name among the matriculates, as it would if he were matriculated, in as much as it gives Patrick Hamilton and others; and there is an absence of historic evidence as to Coverdale's going to Hamburg. The constant argument of the great Reformers against the abuses of Rome was: Scripture is silent, and we cannot rest our faith on any doctrine or institution merely on the authority of the Church or tradition, when the Sacred Scriptures are silent with respect to it. Richard Bentley in his celebrated work on the *Epistles of Phalaris*, London, 1699, uses the argument from silence to prove them to be forgeries, thus, "For had our letter been used or transcribed during that thousand years, somebody would have spoken of it, especially since so many of the ancients had occasion to do so; so that their silence is a direct argument that they never had heard of them." (New edition, 1883, p. 481.) The importance of this line of argument is greatly emphasized by the Roman Catholic scholar Du Pin, in his great work on *Ecclesiastical Writers*, Paris, 1694; Lond., 1696 (p. viii.). "The external proofs are, in the first place, taken from ancient manuscripts, in which either we do not find the name of an author or else we find that of another; the more ancient or correct

they are, the more we ought to value them. Secondly, from the testimony or silence of ancient authors ; from their testimony, I say, when they formally reject a writing as spurious, or when they attribute it to some other author ; or from their silence when they do not speak of it, though they have occasion to mention it. This argument, which is commonly called a negative one, is oftentimes of great weight. When, for example, we find that several entire books which are attributed to one of the ancients, are unknown to all antiquity. When all those persons that have spoken of the works of an author, and besides, have made catalogues of them, never mention such a particular discourse. When a book that would have been serviceable to the Catholics has never been cited by them, who both might and ought to have cited it, as having a fair occasion to do it, 'tis extremely probable that it is suppositious. It is very certain that this is enough to make any book doubtful, if it was never cited by any of the ancients ; and in that case it must have very authentic characters of antiquity, before it ought to be received without contradiction. And on the other hand, if there should be never so few conjectures of its not being genuine, yet these, together with the silence of the ancients, will be sufficient to oblige us to believe it to be a forgery " (in l. c., p. viii.).

Many examples of this argument might be given, but we shall limit ourselves to the Old Testament Scriptures ; some of these arguments will be found valid and some invalid. The validity depends upon the previous question whether the matter in hand really was within the writer's scope. Horne, in his *Introduction* (Vol. ii., p. 31, first edition), presents as an argument against the documentary hypothesis, "one objection, and we apprehend that it is a fatal one, namely, the total silence of Moses as to any documents consulted by him." This would be a valid and "fatal" argument if it could be proved that Moses must have mentioned the documents if he had used them. But this cannot be proven. It was not the custom of ancient authors so to do. It was only occasional, and it was not common or necessary.

It has been argued for many generations that Job must have been written in the Patriarchal age before the Mosaic legislation, on account of the silence of the book as to that legislation. The latest statement of that argument that I have seen is in a supplement to the article of Delitzsch on Job in the *Schaff-Herzog Encyclopædia*, 1883, ii., p. 1187. "Those who hold that the book of Job was written in a very early age, in the time of Moses, or even earlier, urge its un-Jewish tone and its general spirit, which indicate an early period of the race. The absence of all references, direct and indirect, to the

Mosaic law, the temple, the priesthood, and the sacrifices, as well as to Jewish history, is very striking and is justly emphasized. The difficulty of conceiving of a Jew in the reign of Solomon transferring himself to a pre-Mosaic condition of affairs, and ignoring entirely his own religion, cannot be easily set aside." Is this a valid argument from silence? The answer depends on (1) whether these things fairly came within the scope of the author. (2) Whether these institutions of the Pentateuch were really in use, and were known in the Solomonic age. (3) Whether the silence is as stated. Beginning with the third, we agree with this writer that this silence is a most remarkable one, and "cannot be easily set aside." There is no mention of the Sinaitic Covenant, or any sacred writings or sacred institutions of Israel, the kingdom of God, or sacred times. The only offerings are **עולות** and **נדרים**. The only purifications are by water. This silence must be acknowledged. But the other two points are open to criticism and prove to be without force. The observance of the Pentateuchal institutions in the Solomonic age needs to be proven. Those who make so much of the silence of Job have overlooked the still more remarkable silence of other writings of the same class.

The book of Proverbs agrees with Job in making no mention of the Sinaitic Covenant, or the sacred writings (except **משלי שלמה**), or sacred institutions or sacred times. The only offerings are **זבח**, **נדר**, **ראשית**, all primitive offerings, and there is no allusion to Levitical Purifications. Must the book of Proverbs also go into the Patriarchal period? If the silence in the case of Job forces us to that conclusion, the silence of the book of Proverbs, as to the very same things, forces us to the same conclusion. But it is impossible to assign the book of Proverbs to the Patriarchal period, for so many different reasons that no one, so far as we know, has ever thought of it. It is strange that any one should ever have thought of putting Job in that period; for the doctrines of the book as to the divine Wisdom, divine discipline, ethical requirements, and the future state, are identical with those of Proverbs, and at a wide remove from the Pentateuch. The silences and the positive teachings of Job alike are in accord with those of Proverbs. The Song of Songs presents the same features of silence. The book of Ecclesiastes is silent as to the Covenant, sacred writings, the kingdom of God, and sacred times. It mentions **זבח** and **נדר** as in Proverbs. It mentions purifications, but without means. It is distinguished from the other book by the mention of the **מקום קדוש** (iv. 17), and **בית האלהים** (viii. 10). The book of Ecclesiastes belongs without doubt to

the latest writings of the Old Testament. The book of Proverbs contains sentences and poems of Wisdom extending through many centuries, at least from the Solomonic age to the post-Exilic period. Here we have four writings classed together as belonging to the Wisdom Literature of the Hebrews, all characterized by common features of silence as to important religious matters. What does this silence mean? It cannot help us to locate these writings chronologically, for these writings belong to many different centuries of Hebrew history. The silence of Job has been explained as intentional. The author designed to place his hero in the Patriarchal age, and carefully abstained from anything that would be alien to that age; as Longfellow in his *Golden Legend*, and Tennyson in his *Idylls of the King*, transport themselves in imagination into ancient times, and as far as possible set their heroes in the scenery of their own age. This is valid only in part, for the author makes Job and his friends represent characters in their discourse as to divine Wisdom, the discipline of Wisdom, ethical conceptions, and other doctrines, only possible in the Solomonic or post-Solomonic age. The author might avoid glaring inconsistencies in the details of religion, but he could hardly escape unconscious allusions to the religion and institutions of his own period. Whatever validity this argument might have had in the case of Job is entirely destroyed by a consideration of Proverbs, which was not such an ideal production, and where the several authors make no use of this element of fiction.

The silence of Job has also been explained as intentional from another point of view in which the other writings coincide; namely, that the Wisdom Literature represents a speculative type of theology, which purposely ignored ceremonial institutions and externals of religion, a school of thought of a rational and ethical type. There is doubtless truth in this view. The Wisdom Literature stands by itself in the Old Testament Scriptures as representing a different type of theology, which might be called speculative and philosophical, but better, we think, ethical. The authors of Hebrew Wisdom represent an independent section of divine Revelation. They show no dependence on the Mosaic legislation, or on the prophetic instruction. They give forth the teachings of the Divine Wisdom as the highest and best authority, dependent upon no other authority than the Divine Wisdom herself. The traditional view of their dependence on the Law of Moses must be abandoned. They moved in a sphere exterior to the ceremonial worship of Israel; they lived in the school of Wisdom, and cultivated its ethical and speculative principles. They give us a

type of religion which was essentially ethical. And its importance is subordinate to no other in Israel. The ceremonial worship is essentially in a different sphere. But was there involved in this an intentional ignoring of the institutions? We think not. The book of Proverbs urges strongly the payment of first-fruits and votive offerings. The book of Ecclesiastes lays great stress upon worship in the house of God. The prophets, from Samuel on, opposed externalism in worship, and that opposition stares us in the face in their writings. If there were such an opposition in the wise men of Israel, it would appear somewhere in their writings. The silence cannot be explained from religious indifference. The simple, dull, and perverse fools and scorners are the especial objects of attack in the Wisdom Literature. There is a deep moral earnestness in these writings that is wonderful. An ignoring of sacred institutions by these men seems to us incredible. The question now presses upon us, Were these things, about which there is silence, within the scope of the Wisdom Literature? These writings were ethical rather than religious or doctrinal, and therefore we could not expect very many allusions to the items omitted, and many things might escape mention which would not strike our attention as unnatural; and yet there are certain things omitted which clearly come within the author's scope. Job is represented as offering a sacrifice for the sins of his sons: "He rose up early in the morning and offered burnt offerings, according to the number of them all; for Job said, It may be that my sons have sinned and cursed God in their hearts. Thus did Job continually" (i. 5). And the friends of Job were commanded, "Take unto you now seven bullocks and seven rams, and go to my servant Job, and offer up for yourselves a burnt offering; and my servant Job shall pray for you: for him will I accept: lest I deal with you after your folly" (xlii. 8). Why is the **עולה** used as a sacrifice for sin where we would expect, according to the Priests' code, **חטאת**? Job was a leper: why do we not find some reference to the elaborate laws as to the purification of the leper of the Priests' code? The other Wisdom Literature is equally silent as to the sin offering and the Levitical purifications, and yet it seems to us that we should be very likely to find them in ethical writings that lay great stress upon sins of various forms, and their removal. It seems to us, therefore, that with reference to these offerings and purifications, at least, the authors of the Wisdom Literature were ignorant of them, and they could not have been in public use in their times.

Another feature of the Wisdom Literature is the absence of ref-

erence to the supernatural in miracles and prophecy. There is a description of a Theophany in Job xxxvii. sq., but no reference elsewhere in these writings to any such thing. Divine communications are made to men in the training in the school of Wisdom. Is this silence intentional, implying scepticism as to the supernatural, or opposition thereto? Was it beyond the authors' scope, or was it within their scope and yet unknown to their experience? We do not hesitate to follow the opinion that the authors of the Wisdom Literature were unacquainted with supernatural manifestations in their times.

If the silences of the Wisdom Literature are remarkable, the silences of the Psalter are still more remarkable. There is no reference to sacred writings in the Psalter except in Ps. xl., to a book-roll which looks like the law respecting the king (Deut. xvii. 14; I. Sam. x. 25) but does not imply anything else. There is no reference to miracles or prophecy except in recollection of the experiences of the Exodus. There is no sin offering.¹ There is no reference to the trespass

¹ It is generally held that **חטאה** in Psalm xl. 7 is a sin offering. To this we cannot agree. The technical term for sin offering is **חטאת**, a fem. intensive noun. The Piel of the verb is alone used in this sense. The intensive of the noun and verb is alone suited to the idea. It is not reasonable to suppose that the Psalmist should use the technical terms **עולה**, **זבח**, and **מנחה**, and neglect to use **חטאת** if he were thinking of the sin offering. The word **חטאה** is a simple feminine noun of the pretonic class. It is seldom used in the Old Testament. In the other passages, Gen. xx. 9, Pss. xxxii. 1, etc., it can only mean sin. Why should it mean anything else here? The only reasons are the supposed requirement of the context, and traditional interpretation. The latter reason alone is worthless. The former is without real force. For the **זבח** and **מנחה** are closely associated offerings, which belong together, but the **עולה** and **חטאת** are at a wide remove in conception and in usage as well as in historic origin. The ך in both cases is the ך of accompaniment. The strophe should be rendered:—

In peace offering with meat offering thou hast no delight —
ears hast thou bored me.

Whole burnt offerings with sin thou hast not asked —
then, said I,

Lo, I have come with the book-roll,
written respecting me.

To do thy will, my God, I have delight,
and thy instruction is in the midst of my bowels.

In the first line we have open ears contrasted with the communion meal of the **זבח** and **מנחה**. In the second line we have the opened mouth contrasted

offering. The only feasts clearly indicated are New Moons. The few references to purification can be satisfied by thinking of the use of water. Now, the Psalter is composed of some one hundred and fifty pieces of poetry, all in great variety of form and subject-matter, written all along the Hebrew centuries. Silence here is very significant. If the Psalter had been the prayer-book and hymn-book of the first and second temple, how can we explain the absence of references, direct or indirect, to Sabbath, Passover, Pentecost, Tabernacles, and Day of Atonement, the great seasons of Worship? The feasts of lxxxi. 4 are clearly all New Moons. Ps. xlii. 5 is satisfied by thinking of them alone. Were the New Moons the only feasts of national observance in the history of Israel? So far as the authors of these Psalms are concerned, it certainly fell in their way to mention the most important feasts. That the author of lxxxi. 4 lays the stress on the New Moons seems to us to imply that these were the great feasts of his times.

We have seven Penitential Psalms, besides many of Lamentation for sin and trouble. We find in some of these references to sacrifices, **עולה** and **זבח** are emphasized in Ps. li. How was it possible for him to pass over without mention the **חטאת** and **אשם**? For these authors, this silence can have but one meaning. They were ignorant of these sin and trespass offerings.

We find, in two of these, references to purifications, Ps. li. 6, lxxiii. 13, but purification in the use of water satisfies all the circumstances. We have no hint of the use of the ashes of the red heifer or the purification of the leper or the Levitical laws of purity.

with the whole burnt offering accompanied with sin. The third and fourth lines then contrast the coming with the book-roll and the doing of the will of God and the having his instruction within with the sin which is connected with the burnt offering. This makes the strophe harmonious, and the use of **חטאת** is justified, whereas there is no occasion for the use of the sin offering. It is without force, and is out of relation to the last two lines, where the strophe advances to the climax. The reference to the sin is an artistic preparation for the great thought of the strophe, the *obedience* of the Psalmist in profession, action, and inward experience. This is in accordance with the genius of Hebrew poetry. The Psalmist claims to be in entire accord with the will of God, — what propriety is there in referring to sin offering? Under such circumstances **עולה**, **זבח**, and **מנחה** were appropriate. Furthermore, the fact that this is the only passage in the Psalter where there is supposed to be any reference to the sin offering, of itself constrains us to suspect the supposed reference here.

How shall this silence be explained? With reference to certain Psalms, where these things omitted clearly came within the author's scope, it implies ignorance. But, taking the Psalter as a whole, what shall we say as to scope? If the Psalter were ever the official book of the temple worship, the essential forms of that worship would clearly be within the scope of the Psalter. The silence of the Psalter, then, entirely disproves the Traditional theory in this regard. The Psalter could never have been the hymn-book of the first or the second temple. If it could be proved to have been, then the conclusion would be irresistible that during the whole period of the temple worship the Levitical institutions were not observed. It is true that certain Psalms of the last half of the Psalter, and a very few of the earlier half, can be proved to have been used in the temple worship, but the order of their use was different from the order of the Psalter. Rather, the Psalter, in its present form, was arranged for the worship of the synagogue entirely apart from the worship of the temple; and its Psalms were selected from a large number of hymns and prayers of all ages, the most of which expressed individual experiences. They suit very well the synagogue worship, as afterwards the worship of the Christian Church; but they do not suit, save in a few instances, the worship of the temple; and its most solemn services have no Psalms that are appropriate to them.

But the silence of the Psalter proves still more than this. Granted, now, that the Psalms were not composed for temple worship, but expressed individual experience, it is still most singular that the Levitical institutions of the Priests' code find no expression. It proves that the historical religion of Israel, in the times when our Psalms were composed, was less formal and ceremonial, and more spiritual and devout, than the Traditional view implies. The worship was more in accordance with the simpler Covenant codes, and there is no evidence of any knowledge or use of the Priests' code.

The absence of reference to the supernatural in the Psalter, we would explain as in the Wisdom Literature.

From the Psalter we advance into the Prophets. And here we note the silence as to miracles in Jeremiah, Isaiah B, Ezekiel, and post-Exilian Prophets. This seems to us to imply the ignorance of these authors as to any miracles in their times.

Theophanies are unknown to Jeremiah: We conclude from this that no Theophany was granted him. The only mention of sacred writings, other than their own prophecies, that we find in any of the prophets is (1) Hos. viii. 12, which refers to many prophetic To-

roth ; (2) Jer. viii. 8, the **תורת יחור** which, from the context, is written by false prophets ; (3) Mal. iii. 22 (**תורה משה**). We might, from this silence, conclude (1) It did not fall within their scope to mention other sacred writings. They were prophets, and leaned on their own divine authority, and were not disposed to lean on sacred books of other prophets. So Isa. xxxiv. 16, calls his own prophecy **ספר יהור**. False prophets do not hesitate to apply the term to their own prophecies in the time of Jeremiah. Hosea refers to a number of prophetic writings of other prophets.

The only one of the Prophets who alludes to the Mosaic law is Malachi, the last of them. It came within his scope. If it be thus taken for granted that it did not fall within the scope of these Prophets to mention the Mosaic Written Law, then the Traditional view of the Rabbins that the Pentateuch was of primary authority and the Prophets of secondary importance must be abandoned. The Prophets recognize no authoritative writings as higher than their own. They do not find it worth their while to mention any other. The Traditional view must yield also in another particular. It is a mistake that the Prophets were mere expositors of the law of Moses. We do not find any reference in their writings to such a written law which it is assumed they were expounding. The Prophets stand out in entire independence of Moses and his legislation. They give divine Toroth of their own and claim divine authority for them, and do not trouble themselves about other truth. It may also be questioned whether the Traditional theory may not have to yield in another particular. If there was such a body of history and legislation compacted in the written form of our present Pentateuch, could these Prophets have failed to recognize it and allude to it? Could Isaiah use the term **ספר יהור** for his own writings, or Jeremiah speak of the **תורת יהור** of false prophets, if there were well-known and publicly recognized books of legislation called by these names? Does not their silence therefore imply ignorance of any such a law-book or collection of **תורות** as our Pentateuch? It seems to us that we must admit as much as this. It does not prove the non-existence of the codes and narratives of the Pentateuch, but it does prove that they were not known to these Prophets, with the exception of Malachi, as a public official body of legislation and history. The silence of the Prophets as to sacrifices is also significant. Leaving out of account the symbolic code of Ezekiel xl.-xlviii., the **חטאת** is unknown to the Prophets. **אשם** is only found in Isaiah liii., where it has a significance given to it that is appropriate to the context, but not in

accordance with the relative position of the **אִשָּׁא** in the Priests' code.

In view of the great stress laid upon sin and repentance by the Prophets, it is clear that it fell within their scope to mention these sin and trespass offerings. But before considering this omission we will call attention to one other. The Prophets make frequent allusion to Sabbaths and New Moons (Hos. ii. 11; Amos viii. 5; Is. i. 13, 14; lxvi. 23, etc.), but not to other feasts, save only the seventh year indirectly in Jer. xxv. 11, 12 (comp. with II. Chron. xxxvi. 21). The feast of Tabernacles is only in Zech. xiv. 16. There is a reference to feasts in general in Isaiah i. 13 sq., Ezekiel A, and Malachi; but these in Isaiah at least may be sufficiently explained as New Moons and Sabbaths. The omission of the seventh year can be explained as not within the scope of the writers. This can hardly be the case with the Passover, Pentecost, and Tabernacles. The first mention of Tabernacles is in the post-Exilic Prophets. We do not mean that every one of the Prophets must have mentioned these feasts as within their scope, but we do mean that when speaking of the feasts, the stress on the New Moons, in the absence of mention of the other feasts, is not in accordance with the Levitical system. Looking now at Purifications, we find no mention of them in Hosea, Amos, Micah, Isaiah, Ezekiel A, or post-Exilic Prophets. Those of Joel iii. and Jeremiah are only washings.

Now how shall this silence of the Prophets as to the codes of law and the Mosaic ritual be explained? They certainly came within the scope of some of them. There are but two possible solutions: the one is intentional silence; the other is unconscious silence or ignorance. We hold that the former explanation will not meet the facts of the case. The Prophets are not entirely silent; they are silent as to some things and outspoken as to others. There is, without doubt, an antagonism to ceremonialism and formality in the Prophets generally. Compare Hos. v. 6; Mic. vi. 8; Amos v. 21 sq.; Is. i. 11 sq.; Jer. vii. 21 sq. Their hostility is, however, against idolatry and the worship of Baal and Ashtoreth. They emphasize the religion and worship of Jehovah over against these, and one would expect them to emphasize the peculiar institutions of Jehovah; whereas they lay stress on those things which are common to the two religions, namely, **זִבְחִים**, **עֵילוֹת**, and the New Moon feast. Passover, Pentecost, and Tabernacles are ignored. The Purification from contact with the dead, the sin and trespass offerings are ignored. These we would expect the Prophets above all to emphasize. Their silence seems to prove

that they were ignorant of these things, and that these were not observed in Israel in their times.

(5) *Silence is cumulative evidence of non-observance.* The argument from silence increases with the amount of ground covered, until at last it becomes exhaustive in evidence, and exclusive of the matter in question. The argument is increased by its extension in time, place, variety of authors, variety of styles, and of writings. The silence of Job is greatly increased by the evidence of Proverbs, Song of Songs, and Ecclesiastes, of the same class of Wisdom Literature, as to the same matters. The argument from silence in the Psalter is enhanced by the great number of Psalms of different authors, styles, and periods of composition. The argument from silence of the earlier Prophets Joel, Amos, and Hosea, is enhanced by that of Isaiah, Ezekiel, Jeremiah, and the later minor Prophets. The argument from silence increases in weight in writings of the same class, but it is increased to a vastly greater extent by combining together the silence of whole classes of writings, from the Wisdom Literature, the Psalter, and the Prophets, and the Historians, and amounts to one of the strongest lines of evidences, all the more valuable for the induction and generalizations through such a wide range of literature.

Now there are certain things about which all these Hebrew writings are silent. As we have elsewhere said, some of the institutions of the religion of Israel most characteristic of the Priests' code do not occur in the pre-Exilic Literature. The sin offering first and alone appears in the pre-Exilic history in the reform of Hezekiah (II. Chron. xxix. 20-24), and here it is not offered according to the Priests' code. It is not found in the Wisdom Literature, or the Prophets. The **אֶשֶׁת** is found in the Historical books only as a fine of emerods and gold mice paid by the Philistines (I. Sam. vi. 17), and as trespass money (II. Kings xii. 16), and not as an animal sacrifice. The **אֶשֶׁת** occurs in the Prophets only in Is. liii., where it is not in accordance with the Priests' code in idea or importance. It is not found in the Psalter or Wisdom Literature. The offerings of the pre-Exilic Literature are those common to the religion of Jehovah in the Covenant codes, and to the religion of Baal.

The purification in the use of water is occasionally found in the Psalter, Historical books, Prophets, but nowhere in all this literature are the characteristic purifications of the Priests' code to be found.

The sacred feasts upon which the Psalter and Prophets lay stress are the New Moons. The later Prophets also lay stress on the Sabbath. The Historical books speak of the Passover as observed by

Solomon and Hezekiah, but, according to II. Kings xxiii. 21 sq., Josiah was the first to observe it in accordance with the Deuteronomic code, from the Conquest to his day. There is no allusion to the Passover in the Wisdom Literature, Psalter, or Prophets. There is no allusion to Pentecost anywhere. The feast of Tabernacles was first observed in accordance with the Priests' code after the exile (Neh. viii. 17). Hence we are not surprised to meet it for the first time in the Prophet Zechariah. The day of Atonement and year of Jubilee do not appear.

Now it seems to us that this weight of silence is conclusive proof that these things were not known to these Biblical writers, and were not in public observance in the times of silence.

The Priests' code was not observed in Israel until after the exile, and even then only by degrees could its provisions be enforced. The Deuteronomic code was not observed until the reign of Hezekiah. The religion of Israel was, prior to Hezekiah, in accordance with the simpler Covenant codes, in constant conflict with the religion of Baal, at first under the divine direction of Shophetim, and then under the divine direction of the Nebiim, who gave authoritative divine Toroth suited to the circumstances of Israel.

The argument forces us to this result. It is confirmed by other arguments which it would be out of place to consider here. It will not be out of place, however, if we consider just how much this argument from silence involves, and guard it from misuse. We hold that it involves public and general ignorance. There are those who go so far as to argue from it the non-existence of the Pentateuch and the Mosaic codes. But this seems to us going beyond the argument from silence. Before one could conclude from the silence of the Scriptures as to the Pentateuch, that it was not in existence, one would have to prove that it could not exist without being known. This is difficult to prove. We are constantly finding lost documents and long-forgotten books. The book of Deuteronomy was lost and forgotten, as we learn from II. Kings xxii. Some think this carries with it the whole Pentateuch. We believe that Deuteronomy alone is referred to. But it is an easy and natural conclusion that, if the simple code of Deuteronomy could have been lost and forgotten, the more elaborate Priests' code would have been more likely to have been lost and forgotten. If the narrative be true, and there are no good reasons to question it, it supports the argument from silence by positive argument that these Biblical authors were indeed ignorant of the existence of the Pentateuchal codes in their present combination, and that the Priests' code

was not observed prior to the exile. It also prevents the adoption of the conclusion that they had no previous existence. Indeed, it is not uncommon in history that certain institutions are forgotten and buried under others that have assumed their place ; or that certain laws, and even codes, become obsolete and forgotten ; or, indeed, that certain codes, as well as laws, never go into operation in the life and experience of the people. It is also not uncommon in the history of opinion for earlier opinions to pass out of use and become utterly forgotten with their authors. The argument of silence cannot go beyond the ground covered, and can prove nothing as to the existence of those codes and institutions prior to the literature which is silent about them and ignores them.

The argument from silence is capable of vast illustration. There are many important points that we have not had time or space to present, such as the silence of the Pentateuchal narratives as to the period of the captivity in Egypt, and the prolonged wanderings of Israel in the wilderness. These are dark spots in the midst of full and elaborate narratives. Would Moses be likely to pass these periods over in silence if he wrote the narratives of the Pentateuch? If so, what were his reasons for the silence in this case? It could not be from ignorance : it must have been intentional ; and what good reason can be given? If these narratives were not written by Moses, does the silence imply ignorance, and show that the author had no materials or sources of information as to these events? We suggest these as specimens of inquiry as to the force of silence in the Historical books.

Thus far our induction of the facts of the case leads us. We have established the following forms of the argument from silence :

I. The matter in question lies beyond the scope of the author's argument. It is then (*a*) an absence of evidence as to the matter in question, or (*b*) an evidence that it did not possess any of those characteristics that would bring it within the author's scope.

II. The matter in question lies within the author's scope of argument. It was, then, omitted (*a*) for good and sufficient reasons, intentionally, or (*b*) unconsciously, from ignorance of the matter.

III. The argument from silence is cumulative, as it extends over a number of writings, of different authors, of different classes of writings, and different periods of history. In this case it implies either (*a*) external restraint for good reasons, or (*b*) a public ignorance, and, in the case of institutions and laws, a non-observance of them.

Romans IX.-XI.

BY PROF. E. P. GOULD.

THIS section of the Epistle to the Romans contains a discussion of the question Why God rejected the Jews, and how this consists with His original choice of them to be His people? Does not this imply a failure of His word, and so a change in the immutable God? Paul sees that it does, if the choice was, as the Jews supposed, a selection of them as a nation, irrespective of other considerations. And, therefore, his first argument is intended to show that the divine choice was not based on considerations of heredity simply. The original promise was to Abraham and to his seed, and yet not to his seed as such, but to a part of it only, making a choice among his children, on some other basis than mere descent, necessary. In contrast with this, he shows that it was not the mere child of Abraham's body, but a child of promise, a child coming to him as the direct and supernatural result of a divine promise, in whose line the chosen people are to be found. Then, even in the children of this child of promise, there is a further discrimination made, — one being taken and the other left. And here Paul takes up another theory of the ground of choice, and shows that it does not apply to this case, and is, therefore, untenable. It had been supposed that the Jews were chosen on account of their good works. But in this case, certainly, in which the promise precedes the birth of the children, it did not originate in their works, but in the God who called them to their several positions. And yet it was not an arbitrary choice, for, as Paul shows by a quotation of Malachi i. 2, 3, it was based on God's love of the one, and His hatred of the other. And love and hatred are not arbitrary or voluntary feelings, but the necessary results of qualities in the object; that is, the love of being as such is indiscriminative, and has its root in the person loving only; but the love that implies choice and corresponding hatred is based on the qualities of the person loved.

But in thus carrying the matter back to God, and not resting it on the desert of the person chosen, is there not involved an imputation on the divine righteousness? Is not God under obligation to give to

every man his deserts? The reply to this is the familiar and fundamental Pauline axiom, that this whole matter is not one of retributive justice, but of mercy; and that mercy is self-moved, or, in any case, is not determined by desert. It is not the will or endeavor of the man that produces it, but the very nature of the merciful God. The example that Paul adduces of this principle is not, as we should expect, from the number of the chosen, but from the enemies of God whom He rejects. "For this reason," God said to Pharaoh, "did I provoke thee, that I may show in thee my power, and that my name may be proclaimed in all the earth." Therefore, since God has purposes to be accomplished by the pity shown to one, and by the hardening accomplished in another, both are to be traced originally to God's active volition. Now, this is a very important item in the final determination of the apostle's meaning. For this hardening is what makes operative and manifest the divine rejection, and its exact opposite would be not the mercy itself, but that softening which manifests the divine mercy and choice. And if the one is to be traced to an action of God beyond what appears, and which is compulsory and creative in its nature, as is claimed for the gracious action, then the conjunction of the two in this discussion, so that either can be used as an illustration of the principle of God's spiritual action upon men, would seem to demand that the act of hardening be also the simple result of God's action, and not the complex result of that action, together with the yielding or resistance of the man; that is to say, inasmuch as Paul uses an instance of God's hardening action as an illustration of His gracious action, it follows that there must be an identity of principle in the two; and that if the one is purely a divine act without human co-operation, then the other must be the same. In fact, this case of the hardening of Pharaoh is very helpful in determining the scriptural answer to the question whether God's spiritual action in changing and directing the moral attitude of men is absolute and creative, or only influential, depending for its result on the response of men. At the beginning, Ex. iv. 21, God announces His purpose to harden Pharaoh's heart, so that he will not let the people go. Then, there follows a series of signs wrought by Aaron and Moses, but paralleled by the magicians with their enchantments, in which the hardening that results is natural, and easily accounted for. But after the second plague, Pharaoh relents, and the plague is removed. Then, we are told that when he saw that there was respite, he hardened his heart, and hearkened not unto them, as Jehovah had said. Here, the hardening results from the withdrawal of the punishment that had

produced his relenting — again a perfectly natural result — and said, expressly in this case, to be Pharaoh's own act. God's part in the matter is simply His providential and miraculous action, intended and adapted to influence the king, and dependent for its result on the response of Pharaoh to it. After the third plague, which the magicians could not produce, and in which they told Pharaoh that he must recognize the hand of God, he was still hardened, — this time, evidently, as a result of that law of spiritual action by which sin tends to repetition and reproduction. Having hardened himself before, it is easier now to do the same. And so on, through a series of judgments and mercies on the part of God, and of alternate repentings and hardenings in Pharaoh, ending in the final sin of the king after he had let the people go. God even warns Pharaoh in the passage from which Paul quotes, Ex. ix. 14 sq., of the result that these judgments and deliverances will have on him. Now, in order to suppose that God works secretly and supernaturally to harden Pharaoh's heart, we have to introduce the supernatural to account for a perfectly natural result ; and we have to suppose that God works outwardly to accomplish one thing, and inwardly, another directly opposite to it. For these divine warnings, judgments, and mercies are intended to lead Pharaoh to release God's people, and any direct hardening would be, therefore, self-contradictory in God. And yet, whatever means God uses to accomplish this class of spiritual results in man are pointed out by Paul as employed by Him also in His gracious, spiritual action. For the very thing that he illustrates by this example is the relation of God to human character and destiny ; and if that relation is not the same in both cases, then the illustration is irrelevant. But is there no direct action of God in producing this result ? The language employed is partly explained by this fact of God's influence upon men by means of motives ; and yet, if there is any more immediate operation not excluded by other considerations, the strong language used seems to demand it. A supernatural change does seem to be excluded ; but we have already seen that there is a hardening, dulling, or blinding effect produced on the spiritual nature by sin. And this, like every other natural effect, is the operation of a divine law, or more strictly the work of God under law. If I disobey any law of my being, the consequences that I suffer are from God ; and this is true of the spiritual deterioration resulting from sin, as of any other self-inflicted injury ; only this is not an arbitrary or supernatural effect ; it is strictly under law, and, in a certain sense, conditioned by my action.

And yet again, the statements of the apostle so far have been such

as to exclude the supposition that the originating cause of the divine mercy can be in the man himself. Mercy is undeserved and free ; it originates not in the will or endeavor of man, but in the merciful nature of God. God's choice of men, in the apostle's thought, is not of those who have of themselves sought Him out, but of those whom He has sought and drawn by His love to Himself. The first step in the approach of God and man to each other is taken by God. There is a mercy of God that precedes and produces the repentance of man, which is merely the response of man to the merciful God.

These three things, the precedent action of God, the response of man, and the final impress of God on human character, as the resultant of these two, fill out the apostle's thought so far. No one of them can be omitted without doing violence to some part of that thought.

But it is the part of God in this that has been made most prominent, more prominent than it is eventually. The human element has been implied, or hinted at, rather than expressed. And so the apostle meets the objection right here, that this seems to throw the responsibility of human character on God. If God pities whom He will, and hardens whom He pleases, why, He cannot find fault with them ; for they are what He makes them ; no one has resisted His hidden, inscrutable, irresistible will. His first answer to this is the presumptuousness of the question. Man is clay in the hands of the potter, and the potter has the right to make different vessels, some for honor and some for dishonor, out of the clay. And so God has the right to make out of our common humanity different men for different uses and destinies. But is this a right of mere power and sovereignty? Let us listen closely to the language, and see if it yields us the unwelcome idea that *might makes right*. Suppose that we leave it in this way, retaining all the power that there is in the apostle's statement. *Has not man, any man, the right to fashion clay as he pleases?* This is immensely different from Paul's statement, and yet there is the same power in it. But what gives the potter his right is his skill to fashion the clay. We have to introduce into Paul's question the attributes of God, the divine holiness, justice, and love, by which He, if any, can mould and fashion human spirit to the best advantage, and not simply His sovereign right to do as He pleases, to make Him the potter of this human clay. And then we have to remember what Paul means here by God's forming of us. It is not our creation, but the shaping of our character that is intended, that long spiritual process by which nature becomes character, by which tendencies are moulded into traits, and fluctuating

impulses become steady principles. What we have to remember is what Paul at least never forgets, that this is not clay, but a very different stuff, with which God deals, and that this is the last place into which to introduce arbitrary and absolute action. The apostle's argument is not simply that God has absolute and unquestionable power, since all things are at His disposal, to use His pleasure about them, but that His wisdom and holiness and love are such as to make questioning of Him presumptuous. The spiritual qualities that make Him the skilful and wise fashioner of our spiritual beings are put by Paul into his application of the right of the potter to mould the clay. And this is only to say that God is self-limited: He cannot act contrary to His own attributes.

But in the second part of his answer, Paul reaches really the climax of his thought. The question is, why, since God Himself fashions men and accomplishes in them His own purposes, does He blame men if they turn out badly? The answer is a consideration of the means by which God produces His effects. Supposing, Paul says, that God, wishing to exhibit His wrath and to make known His power, bore in much long-suffering vessels of wrath fitted for destruction, what then? The answer is simply that God employs such means in hardening men's hearts as leave the responsibility entirely with them. If they are rendered hard and unrepentant by God's patience and long-suffering, that is their own fault. For God's action is such as to produce repentance and love, if it is not thwarted by man. And the apostle sees that if God wishes to show His wrath against sin, this is the only way open to Him. For if He acts at all in such a way as to produce hardness, creatively or absolutely, or through man's following instead of fighting Him, then He cannot be angry with man. He can only blame Himself. That is to say, this is Paul's answer to the objection, that God leaves Himself no room to judge men if His action upon them is absolute; viz., that His action is not absolute, but dependent on man's response to it, His action in the case of men whom He hardens, being adapted in itself to produce exactly the opposite result.

So far, the thought seems plain. But what is the relation to this of the clause that follows? If we make the participial clause in v. 22 concessive, as Meyer and others do, then we have to supply mentally an unexpressed purpose of the patience denoted by the verb, with which to connect this additional purpose. For instance, Meyer says that the object of God's bearing with the vessels of wrath is to exhibit his long-suffering, which he finds implied in the phrase

"in much long-suffering." Moreover, the conjunction at the beginning of v. 23, in this case, has to be translated *also*, a meaning that it has, but with which its place is more naturally somewhere else than at the beginning of the clause. Or, if we say with others, Fritzsche included, that this clause denotes the purpose of the participial clause, "fitted unto destruction," the connection of thought becomes exceedingly difficult, as also the grammatical connection of a noun with a preposition and a clause introduced by a telic conjunction, as co-ordinate designations of purpose. Still another device, adopted by Tholuck, Godet, and others, is to make this clause a part of a new sentence, the principal verb of which is the "called" belonging to the relative clause of v. 24. But they fail to explain the peculiar turn or twist of the apostle's thought by which a principal becomes a relative clause. On the other hand, if we make the participial clause in v. 22 causal, as most commentators do, instead of concessive, then there does not seem to be any grammatical difficulty, and very little logical difficulty in making v. 23 co-ordinate with that as a designation of God's purpose in his patience. According to this, God had a twofold purpose in his forbearance. One was to make a place for His wrath against sin, the other was to open the way for His mercy toward those who were led to repentance. But how shall we get rid of the serious difficulty that the object of the verb "bore" is not the general class *men*, but the particular class *vessels of wrath*? If the meaning is that God by His forbearance leads some men to repentance and so to glory, and others to hardness and so to wrath, the exact expression of it would be, *if God wishing to show His wrath, and make known his power upon vessels of wrath fitted for destruction, bore with men; and that He might make known the riches of His glory upon vessels of mercy fitted for glory, what then?* In the first place, it is to be noted in reply, that the expression is inexact as it stands, however it may be explained. In order to express the contrast that seems to be demanded by the contrasted expressions "vessels of wrath" and "vessels of mercy," they should both be made the objects of corresponding verbs, and occupy corresponding places in the two parts of the statement. We are prepared for something less than exactness of contrast by the different positions in the sentence, one in the principal, and the other in a subordinate, clause. In the second place, it is the starting-point in the apostle's view of man that all men are originally vessels of wrath, a condition from which some of them are brought by the grace of God to become vessels of mercy. If all men were looked on by the apostle as having

a good or indifferent start in moral condition, from which they passed into states of morality or immorality, this would demand the exact contrast spoken of. But inasmuch as Paul looks on himself and all men as originally evil, so that all men who are saved now stand in contrast not only with men now lost, but also with a previous lost condition in themselves, the expression can stand as it is, since all that we want is a class including all men after the principal verb. It is certainly in favor of this interpretation, that it corresponds exactly with the actual history of God's dealing with the Jews, which is the special case under consideration, and with the case of Pharaoh, which he has left, to be sure, but only just left.

This resolves God's spiritual action into unity. It is not one action here and another there, opposite means to accomplish opposite results, but one uniform, gracious action, that leaves the responsibility of opposite results with men.

Another thing to be noticed here is the use of the apparently neutral word, "bore," to denote this gracious action. With the ordinary conception of God, this would be absolutely colorless and unsatisfactory. But with the idea of the purely spiritual, luminous, holy Being presented to us in the New Testament, whose nature is light and love, all that we need to be told is that God bears with men, and we are able to fill it out immediately with the thought of this unintermitted beating of the divine light and love against the closed and darkened chambers of the human spirit. The normal divine activity is gracious and moving and illuminating, and "bearing" means no merely neutral or negative thing, but the uninterrupted course of this activity.

God's people, then, is a spiritual people. What the apostle has shown negatively is that membership in that people is not determined by birth, nor by righteous works, nor by the will and endeavor of man; it is neither inherited nor merited. Positively he has indicated that this membership is based on God's discriminating love; that the qualities calling forth this love are not self-originated, but divinely produced in men; that it is a matter dependent, not on God's justice, but on his mercy; that God has a right thus to fashion the spirits of men, not absolutely and creatively, but by spiritual processes arising from His divine skill and resources; and finally, that God's action in creating both good and evil character is a gracious action, making the different results dependent on the secondary action of man.

And so he says that this is the people whom God calls, not Jews alone, nor Gentiles as such, but those whom he prepares for glory.

The Jews have been for the most part the only people that He has had. But inasmuch as it is a spiritual and not a hereditary matter, inasmuch as the Jews were chosen not as Jews, but as embodying certain spiritual conditions belonging to the people of God, it may at any time cease to be Jews, and come to be some other people, whom God chooses as His own. The moment that it is understood that God's people are a spiritual people, that moment it becomes impossible to confine the privilege to any nation. This possibility of change of condition in any people, so that those who are not beloved may become the people of God, Paul confirms by a quotation from Hosea ii. 23. It is applied by him to the case of the Gentiles, but as originally used by the prophet himself it had a significance of its own, quite as pertinent and important for Paul's argument. For it represents Israel herself as lapsed from God's favor, and no longer His people. This condition of things they have brought about themselves by their sins and unfaithfulness. But God exhorts them, "O Israel, return unto the Lord thy God, for thou hast fallen by thine iniquity!" and promises them, "I will heal their backsliding, I will love them freely" (ch. 14). Just as their sins have led to a change in their relation to God, so that the people of God has become *Lo ammi*, and the objects of His mercy are called *Lo ruhamah*, so their return to God will cause them to be called *Ammi* again, and their repentance will restore to them the name *Ruhamah*.

Then Paul quotes from Isaiah a statement to the effect that of Israel only a remnant would be saved, a very small remainder, the sinful majority being destroyed by the righteous sharp judgments of God, in order that by this purging Jerusalem might once more become a city of righteousness. The Jews' own Scriptures contain statements which show that God is under no positive obligation to continue the whole Jewish people in His favor, nor to exclude the Gentiles from His love. And now the apostle comes to that for which all that he has said has been preparing the way. That which constitutes men the people of God is a state of acknowledged and accepted righteousness. And the strange paradox is that Gentiles who were not in pursuit of that attained it, while the Jews, who were striving to come up to a law of righteousness, did not attain to it. Striving to be the righteous people of God, keeping all the minutiae of a law; how well that represents the condition of Saul himself: and yet not righteous; how he had proved that out of his own experience. And on the other hand here were the morally indifferent Gentiles becoming at a leap, as it were, the acknowledged people of God. It

is because, as he has already shown, this righteousness is not the attainment of man, but the gift of God. And on the part of man therefore it is not the result of endeavor or works, but of faith. Here then is the proper antithesis of the statements that it is not from works, not of him that wills, nor of him that runs. For here we have these same negative statements, but instead of the antithetical statements that it is from Him that calls, and from the pitying God, we have the faith of man given as the antithesis. And the connection between the two is plain. For the righteousness that proceeds from faith is not a product of independent human endeavor, but of divine inspiration, and faith itself, as we shall see later, is regarded by the apostle as awakened and drawn out of us by the truth and the touch of God. God is the source, and faith is the human medium, of this righteousness. And so the apostle's whole view is that God's choice of men depends first, on His own mercy and grace, and secondly, on the faith of men awakened by that grace, and bringing to us the divine fruits of righteousness. But a man who simply receives the law as an objective command, and endeavors independently to build up a righteousness having its sources in himself, without divine inspirations and trust, fails to attain the righteousness of God. The Jews, having their own works, and not faith in God, as the foundation and characteristic of their righteousness, stumbled over the stone of stumbling. Jesus being come to deliver them and all men from sin, and not to glorify and exalt their righteousness over a sinful world, was rejected by them. This is confirmed by a curiously jointed quotation from *Is. viii. 14* and *xxviii. 16*.

The tenth chapter is occupied with a development of this thought, that it is the righteousness of faith, and not of works, that commends men to God. Paul characterizes it as the righteousness of God. And by this he means not that which God calls righteousness, nor a righteousness acceptable to Him, but a righteousness of which God is the author, as contrasted with the man's own righteousness, built up by himself. The whole drift of the argument is to prove this idea of a dependent and inspired righteousness. In opposition to this is the principle of legal righteousness, that life comes from a performance of its commands. But the righteousness of faith does not leave man to bring down a Saviour from heaven, nor to raise him from the dead, but it provides him with a word to be believed. Just as the God of the Jews did not require men to find a law and then to obey it, but brought His law to them, and required of them only obedience, so now he does not leave them to procure for themselves an object of

faith, but provides Himself that which is abundantly able to inspire faith. This is fundamental in the apostle's thought, that God not only requires faith, but inspires it. In looking around for that which men would seek, if they were really in search of that on which their faith might rest, Paul finds it in the incarnate and risen Christ. But that is just what God has provided, and therefore faith, when it arises, has been called forth by Him through the vision of Christ. Two points are worthy of special attention in this statement : first, that not only faith, but confession is required ; and second, that the faith is in the risen, and not in the crucified Jesus. The insistence on confession is one form of the familiar New Testament idea, that the inward principles and sentiments which make the basis and spring of its righteousness are properly attested only by the outward acts to which they give rise. There must be an outward acknowledgment and expression of the inward sentiments, or they are dead and ineffective. Under this principle sometimes baptism or an acted confession is required ; sometimes a spoken confession ; but sometimes, with a deeper insight still, the whole outward life of piety and virtue is demanded as the only true expression of a living faith. The second point, that the faith required is in a risen Christ, is in accordance with the broad range given to faith in the New Testament. In the early preaching of Jesus, it is faith in the good news that the kingdom of God is at hand ; in the early preaching of the apostles, it is belief in Jesus as the Messiah ; in the first epistle of John, it is belief in Jesus as the Son of God ; and here, it is belief in the resurrection, while in the Epistle to the Hebrews the varied faith of the Old Testament saints is described as saving. There is no dogmatic restriction of faith, as if it were the effect of one truth upon God that gave faith its efficacy ; but a wide range is given to it, showing that it is the effect of all great truth to renew and regenerate man that gives faith its importance.

But this is a righteousness also that makes no distinction between Jew and Gentile. For the promise is, that every one that calls on the name of the Lord shall be saved. Joel ii. 32. And, moreover, God is not the God of the Jews only, no mere national deity like the gods of the heathen, but the universal God, having riches for all that call on Him. To be sure, the prophecy quoted by the apostle is in regard to the Jews, and their deliverance out of the hand of their invaders. But this is a good example of the way in which Paul wrests spiritual meanings out of the narrow historical sense of the Old Testament. For the moment that the promise is made conditional, and the condition spiritual, as here, it is raised above the narrow intent of the

original, and becomes no longer a matter of Jew and Gentile, but of spiritual quality wherever found. If the Jews were called originally, not as Jews, but as those who invoked the name of the Lord, then if at any time they cease to invoke the divine name, their call lapses; and on the other hand, if the Gentiles began to call on that name, just so far the call of God extends to them.

Then the apostle shows by a series of questions that this invocation implies faith, and faith hearing, and hearing preaching, and preaching a message, and that this righteousness is therefore to be traced to God. Faith comes through hearing, and hearing through the word of God. It is God through His gospel who awakens faith in us, and therefore the righteousness of faith is a divine work. The universality of this gospel is proved negatively, by showing that its blessings are limited, not by national distinctions, but by a lack of obedience to it; and positively, by the fact that its messengers have been sent into all the earth. And, moreover, the Jews themselves were informed of this; for both Moses and Isaiah warned them of the possibility that God might turn from them to another people. Paul stretches the meaning of the passage from Isaiah, giving it two meanings and applications instead of one. It is really a series of three parallel statements of God's continued gracious expostulation with His rebellious people Israel, and reads like this: "I gave access to myself to those that asked it not; I was propitious to those that sought me not; I stretched out my hands all the day to a disobedient and resistant people." But this restricted sense of the original really contains by implication the other, since it shows us Israel as a rebellious people, from whom God must eventually turn. For God proceeds to say: "I will not keep silence, but I will recompense, even recompense into their bosom, your iniquities and the iniquities of your fathers together, saith the Lord"; and again, "For the Lord God will slay thee, and will call His servants by another name" (vv. 6, 7, 15).

In the eleventh chapter Paul comes to a new and exceedingly important part of his question. He has shown that God's rejection of the Jews does not necessarily involve unfaithfulness on His part, because His choice of them in the first place was on spiritual, and not on national, grounds. It was therefore conditional on their retaining the spiritual qualities that occasioned the original choice, and would therefore be in the nature of things, what the whole history of the Jews has shown it to be, the choice of a part greater or less, rather than the choice of the whole nation, and moreover would terminate with the failure of the Jews to comply with these spiritual conditions.

And for the same reason that the Jews might be rejected, other nations might come in to take their place, and the kingdom of God become Gentile, rather than Jewish, in its nationality, while still retaining its characteristic spiritual quality. This is what Paul saw taking place under his eyes, and what he says is therefore intensely practical. But he still feels himself confronted by the question, whether this involves a final rejection of God's ancient people, to whom, in spite of all their apostasy, He has always heretofore clung. Does this coming in of the Gentiles mean, as events seem to indicate, a casting off of the Jews? This he, as a Jew, with strong national feelings and antecedents, repudiates. And he does it in language which opens up a new phase of the question. "God did not," Paul says, "reject His people whom He foreknew." This foreknowledge is in the New Testament made the antecedent and ground of God's choice. And here it is put forward as the fact about His people which makes it impossible for Him to reject them. Just as human choice is based on knowledge of the worth or desirableness of the thing chosen, so God's choice is determined by His foreknowledge of the same. And right here is the reason of the permanence of God's choice, and of His choice of the Jews as a nation, instead of a selection of individuals among all the nations. That is the fact which remains to be accounted for, supposing that the choice is not arbitrary, but rational and accountable. Why is it that God still clung to this nation as a nation when they apostatized? And how is it that, after a long period, in which to all appearance God has had a nation for a people, He seems now to be changing to what, on the principles enunciated by the apostle, would have seemed to be the more natural course from the beginning, a culling out of individuals from all nations? The answer to this, hinted at by Paul here, and expressly stated elsewhere, is that God foresaw in the Jews not only the occasional faith or spiritual apprehension that characterized them, but a permanent spiritual faculty, a capacity for faith and holiness peculiar to them. Back of particular acts and shining examples of faith lay this hereditary and national trait, exercised or unexercised, that made them the pre-eminently religious nation. Hence, in periods of national degeneracy and unbelief, together with God's wrath and rejection, which were emphasized even by his knowledge of this spiritual faculty, there was yet a knowledge of this natural adaptability for faith and spiritual achievement that made them still His people, though a lost and degenerate people. This is what makes possible a national choice, over and above the selection

of individuals. The choice of the nation is because of this fitness to receive divine gifts and promises, but the final selection of individuals is because of their actual appropriation of these. This, I think, will be found to be the key to this strange and perplexing chapter.

In confirmation of this statement, that God does not cast off His people, whom He chose because He foreknew them, Paul introduces a statement, showing that, even in the time of the great national apostasy preceding the captivity, God left Himself seven thousand men who had not joined the prevalent Baal worship. There was a rejection, not of the whole nation, but of a part, and an election of the remnant to be His people. And this same principle obtained now, there being now as then, a remnant according to the election of grace. Here the apostle brings out the contrast between this divine principle of grace and the human principle of meritorious works. But, as we have seen, this does not include all human conditions of God's choice, but only that of works. There are, in the apostle's thought, two contrasted systems, that of grace and that of justice. Under the system of justice, the human condition of God's favor is works of merit; under that of grace, the condition is faith. The same thought appears in the succeeding statement, in which Israel as a whole is represented as seeking the favor of God and not obtaining it. The implied contrast to this is an election, or a chosen part of the people, which, instead of seeking, was itself sought by God. The remainder, who sought God independently and on the ground of merit, instead of accepting Him and allowing themselves to be found by Him, were hardened.

This, then, is the first part of the apostle's answer to the question, whether God cast off His people. It is only a part that is rejected, and these are rejected because their righteousness has degenerated into self-righteousness, and their religiousness has expended itself in seeking after an unrevealed God, instead of accepting the revealed One. And now he comes to the second part of this inquiry. "Did they stumble in order to fall?" Was this the divine purpose of their stumbling? We have already seen that the process by which moral stumbling leads to falling is in accordance with a divine law, and there can be no doubt that what God does He intends to do. But the question is whether this is the ultimate divine purpose, whether God is contented to stop here, and allow evil under His government to work only evil. Paul rejects this idea with aversion. And, instead of this, he says that the purpose of God is to accomplish by the falling away of the Jews the salvation of the Gentiles, and in turn,

by this, to provoke the Jews to emulation. In the first part of this statement, Paul is simply giving the philosophy of current religious history. Jewish Christianity was tending more and more to narrowness and exclusiveness. It was inevitable that it should be so. The long time in which they had occupied the position of God's people had cultivated in them spiritual pride, and made it impossible for them to see the barriers taken down with any complacency. And so there were two great characteristic features of early Christian history : First, the struggle of Christianity with Judaism ; and, second, the conflict between Pauline, or Catholic Christianity, with Judaic Christianity. Judaism tried to crush Christianity because it threatened to swallow up Jewish privilege in a universal religion, and Judaism within the church strove to prevent its becoming a universal religion. The Judaizers were willing that other nations should come in, but only on condition of receiving the distinctive mark of Judaism. They were willing that Christianity should embrace all nations, but unwilling that it should itself be given a corresponding breadth. Just as Christians now are willing to welcome Christian unity, but unwilling to give Christianity the breadth necessary to unity. Now Paul's thought is that this narrowness of Judaic Christianity makes it incompatible with any great work among the Gentiles that the Jews should be converted *en masse*. The present conquest of Judaism by Christianity would be so much in the nature of a compromise between the two, that it would greatly hinder the conquest of the Gentiles, involving, as that did, the universality of the Gospel. And he sees that the very thing that gives Judaic Christianity its narrowness is also preventing any general conversion of the Jews to Christianity, and thus that this type of Christianity is deprived of the dangerous influence that it might otherwise have. The door is open to the Gentiles, as it might not otherwise be. And so evil does not end in evil, but works good as well.

And yet the apostle sees that it is not an unmixed good, for he immediately proceeds to say that if their falling away is the riches of the world, much more will their fulness enrich the world. But if there is a real connection of cause and effect between their loss and the enrichment of the Gentiles, how can the opposite condition of their fulness produce the same effect in a greater degree? In the first place, we have seen that the same thing, the proud exclusiveness of the Jews, has produced both the narrowness of Judaic Christianity and the general failure of the Jews to accept Christianity. Only therefore the destruction of this narrow spirit, and the introduction of

a different disposition among them, in sympathy with the breadth of Christianity, would be compatible with their fulness, that is, their general conversion to Christianity. Their general conversion could take place therefore only in connection with the removal of that which made them a hindrance to the conversion of the Gentiles. And in the second place, that which made their loss the enriching of the Gentiles would make their fulness much more so. Their influence, and the inherited familiarity with religious ideas and aptness for religious things that gave them influence, made their loss or gain no indifferent matter. As long as they remained narrow, it was well for the church that they should remain out of it, since in it they would be sure to stamp it with their own spirit. But if they should lose this narrowness, and with it their great aversion to Christianity, then the general conversion to Christianity that would accompany it would bring to the church a great accession of well-directed spiritual force. This same spiritual influence that made it a gain to the church and to the world for them to be out of it, as they were, would, with the change that would bring them generally into the church, become a great advantage to it.

This, then, is the course of the apostle's thought so far in the discussion of this part of the question. First, that God's people are such because God saw and foresaw in them a pre-eminent spiritual quality. Second, that therefore God never rejects them as a people, but graciously, and without any merit on their part, chooses out some for salvation. Third, that this general apostasy now is intended to restrict the influence of Judaism within the church, and so leave the door open for the Gentiles, and ultimately to bring them in, after Christianity has received the stamp of Catholicity. Fourth, that that which makes their influence now dangerous in the church will make it then an inestimable blessing. The general proposition to which all this tends is that the Jews are still God's people under a temporary eclipse. The proof of this is found in two propositions. First, in this, that the holiness of the first fruits involves that of the lump; and, second, in this, that the holiness of the root results in that of the branches. Both of these involve the common principle of heredity, one an heredity of privilege, and the other of nature. Children inherit from their parents in God's view something of the sacredness attaching to their parents, and also the holiness of nature belonging to them. And moreover it is probable from what the apostle has said, that the more important of these, and the cause of the other, is the inheritance of spiritual quality or tendency. This is the reverse

of the doctrine of heredity, underlying that of the fall of man. Just as the apostle shows in ch. 5 that evil is transmitted from father to son, making the first sin universal in its consequences, so here he shows that holiness is alike transmissible, so that the holiness of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob resulted in the holiness of the nation. And yet this is a holiness of nature, not of character; of tendency, not of fixed quality. It leaves individual character to develop itself freely, giving rise to different characters and destinies, and yet insuring a holy seed continually. The choice of Abraham's seed is therefore provisional, and the final choice of individuals depends on the development of the spiritual quality transmitted to them.

Hence, in spite of the holiness of the root, and of the branches as a result, some of the branches may be broken off, and, in spite of the evil of the Gentile root, some of its branches may turn out well. Heredity tends to the production of character, but does not determine it. But it is the way in which Paul states this fact of the connection of the Gentiles with the people of God that gives this part of the discussion its special significance. They are represented as grafted into the holy stock of the original people of God, and becoming partakers of the root and fatness of the olive tree. This is a modification of the general New Testament view that all men alike, without any distinction, derive spiritual sustenance from God or from Christ. But it is a development of Christ's statement that salvation is from the Jews. And it is a view of religious history the analysis of which shows a striking conformity with the facts. Individualism, and the growth of the individual by immediate connection with God, is true, but it is only a part of the truth. The race is also an entity, and race continuity and growth are as much truths as that the individual abides through all changes, and grows by what it acquires. Israel, by virtue of this law, has acquired a spiritual growth, and accumulated a stock of spiritual truths and virtues and influences, into the possession and benefit of which the other nations are now entering. Christ himself, though his perfect spiritual quality, is due to an incarnation, by which, after all these natural means had failed, there was injected into our sinful humanity a divine and healing principle; though he was born into, not out, of the race, yet followed this law so far that he came into the line of this spiritual development. He did not make a separate and individual revelation, but culminated and perfected that revelation, which had in turn produced, and been produced through, a spiritual race. And though this accumulated spiritual force had been misdirected and perverted in the time of

Jesus, yet the leaders and instructors of the church had to be taken from the race in which it inhered, though, as a whole, it furnished instead its rejectors and persecutors. From this, then, it appears that the Jews were to continue to be, by virtue of this inherited spiritual quality, the people of God, and that other nations were to become members of that people only by partaking of the spiritual influences and knowledge that had been stored up for the world in them. Christianity itself is in this view only the development and final form of Judaism. Its Scriptures are rightly incorporated with the Jewish Scriptures, and are themselves probably all written by Jews ; its apostles are the continuation of the splendid line of Jewish prophets, and its Christ is the Messiah of the Jews. The Jews, therefore, are the spiritual progenitors of the Christian church, the holy stock on which the redeemed of the Gentiles are grafted.

Therefore, Paul says, the Gentiles cannot boast over the Jews. There may be now a displacement of the Jews in great part, in order to prevent their narrowness from excluding the Gentiles. But the spiritual force and light, of which they become partakers, is Jewish, and not Gentile. Moreover, the principle of faith, which makes the present difference between them, is inconsistent with boasting, as it glorifies God and not man. And the reversal of their respective present positions is much more likely under similar conditions than the reversal of their original positions. This statement is based, of course, on the fact that the Jews' position among the people of God is a natural one, belonging to them on account of inherited traits, and that faith in them will therefore lead to the manifestation of spiritual aptitudes already in possession. While the Gentiles, in whom the inherited dispositions are rather unspiritual and immoral even, have to overcome these by faith. This doctrine of heredity of spiritual, as of unspiritual, dispositions, making men germinal, but not actual, members of God's people, so that the development of actual unspiritual qualities in them is to fall away from their original, natural place, making the apostle's doctrine of heredity complete, is of very great importance in the vindication of God's ways.

In accordance with this inherited quality and disposition of the Jews, and with the fact of God's gracious action everywhere, so that even their falling away accomplishes the gracious purpose of God toward the Gentiles, Paul looks forward to the time when all Israel will be saved. When the full number of the Gentiles has been gathered, when Christianity has become a universal religion, then, at last, the emulation of the Jews will be aroused, and the whole people

will be redeemed. This he confirms by a quotation from Isa. lix. 20, 21, which, however, is not conformed to either the Septuagint or the original Hebrew in anything except merely the statement that the deliverer is coming. In the original, he is represented as coming to or for Zion, and to or for those that turn from iniquity in Jacob. This common inexactness of the New Testament writers, in quoting from the New Testament, would seem to indicate that they did not depend on reproducing even the sense of the particular passage quoted, but simply on recalling the general spirit or drift of the Old Testament, which they clothed in such familiar Scripture language as came to them.

The summing up of this part of the discussion is that on the basis of the Gospel, which is the present standard of judgment and distinction among men, the Jews are enemies of God, because they do not exercise toward it that faith which is the divine requirement under it. But this enmity is also on account of the Gentiles, who, because of it, find the Gospel open to them. But on the ground of election, in which Paul has shown that the final choice of individuals rests on individual faith, but also that there may be choice of a nation or a family as a provisional matter, — a general or probable selection, based on the hereditary transmission of spiritual dispositions leading to faith, — the Jews are beloved on account of the faith of their fathers. This actual faith in them has produced germinal and possible faith in their descendants, and so God has never been left without an actual people among this nation, who are all his *in posse* if not *in esse*.

The reason that is given for this statement, that, according to election, the Jews are beloved, is that the gifts and the calling of God are unrepented. Having bestowed gifts on a people, and called them to Himself, God does not repent and recall them. As we have seen, He continues the gifts, transmitting them from father to son by the law of heredity ; and so, the people that God once calls, remain His. Paul, evidently, makes a distinction here between the call of individuals and that of a nation. He sees in one the proof of sporadic and incidental traits that tend to run out and disappear ; and in the other, indications of more essential and deeply seated qualities that remain as permanent national traits. Of course they are subject to the mutations that inhere in moral actions and states as such ; but, relatively, they are permanent. One nation has the gift and calling of intellectual greatness, another of superiority in art, another of moral pre-eminence ; and these are more enduring than the same things in individuals. And Israel is seen by the apostle to have the permanent national trait of

religiousness that makes it, in spite of partial defections, the beloved people of God. This he proves by rehearsing again the course of God's providential dealing with both Jews and Gentiles, in which the latter are shown to have been disobedient, but to have had the door of mercy finally opened to them through the disobedience of the Jews ; and, on the other hand, the Jews, whose disobedience has procured this mercy for the Gentiles, are themselves ultimately to be restored to God's mercy, through the mercy shown to the Gentiles. God's purpose, that is to say, in the present rejection of the Jews, is not that rejection itself, but mercy to the Gentiles, and, ultimately by means of that, mercy to the Jews. The latter's defection and rejection are thus not final nor vindictive, but temporary in their effects, and gracious in their purpose. And this Paul shows to be characteristic of all God's dealing with sin. By His own law of moral continuance and progress by means of natural consequence and heredity, He shuts up sinners to their sin. But this legal and natural effect of sin He supplements by His own gracious action, working under the same law ; and so the present consequence of sin in the race always looks forward to a final redemption. God shut up all unto disobedience, in order that He may have mercy on all. And the same laws of moral action, influence, growth, and transmission, which made the universal prevalence of sin necessary, are those which render a final, universal redemption possible.

And so, finally, before this contemplation, — not of God's absolute and unaccountable judgments, but of a wisdom that grows continually in depth and brightness, as we contemplate it, — the apostle exclaims : "O the depth of the riches, both of the wisdom and knowledge of God !" And, in the same connection, he means, by the unsearchableness of God's judgments, not that they are based on principles unknown or undiscoverable by man, for his whole discussion has been a searching out of the principles and methods of God's dealing with man, but that they are full of a boundless wisdom and knowledge that outreaches all the pursuit and discovery of man. Moreover, the reason given shows another idea contained in the language. God's ways are so based on absolute wisdom and knowledge that man cannot foreknow or determine them. Otherwise, he might know not only the ways, but also the mind of God, and might share His counsels.

But the apostle does show the impossibility of establishing any original claim on God. Everything is from Him and through Him and for Him ; all being is from Him and in Him ; and all the action of moral beings, while it is free, is yet so preceded and shaped by the divine action,

that it cannot constitute an original claim on the divine judgment, but becomes only an acceptance or rejection of the divine grace. This is the key-note of the apostle's thought ; the immanence of the infinitely gracious and wise God, who does not leave men in individual isolation to work out their own destiny and receive a judicial award, but so binds men together, in each other, and in Him, and makes for them a world of gracious influence and association in which to dwell, and Himself dwells in them a constant source of light and love, that what they are, whether good or evil, receives its character from the free action of men, not in a world made by themselves, but in God's world, where the great tides of the ceaseless, divine activity are the central fact.

The Historical Testimony of the Prophet Zephaniah.

BY PROF. H. FERGUSON.

THE prophecy of Zephaniah is stated (i. 1) to have been uttered in the reign of Josiah the son of Amon, King of Judah. The contents of the prophecy are entirely in accordance with this statement, and the authenticity of the book has never been questioned. To decide exactly to what period of the reign of Josiah it belongs, is more difficult. It was evidently, however, written before (but not long before) the destruction of Nineveh (ii. 13-15), which event took place, according to the most generally received chronology, B.C. 606, some five years after Josiah's death. From the expression "remnant of Baal" (i. 4), and from the general tone of zeal for Jehovah, and reproof and reproach for his enemies, we may conclude that it was written after the beginning of the reformation of Josiah, in the twelfth year of his reign;¹ and probably after the discovery of the book of the Law, in his eighteenth year. It is therefore in the last nineteen years of Josiah's reign that we place the date of this prophecy; and as the "King's children"² are denounced in it, it is most probable that it was not delivered until towards the end of this period, as otherwise these would have been too young to be responsible for their actions, or to merit such bitter reproof and denunciation, since at the time of the discovery of the Law, Jehoiakim was only twelve years old, Jehoahaz only ten, while Zedekiah was not even born. We cannot be far wrong if we put the date of the prophecy at or near the twenty-fifth year of Josiah (B.C. 617-616).

¹ So Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Rosenmüller, Jahn, Bleek, Hitzig, Keil, Delitzsch. De Wette (Schrader) considers it to belong to the first years of Josiah, before the Reformation began; so also Ewald and Hävernick.

² On this point the majority of modern commentators are inclined to consider that children of some former king are meant; but the reasons adduced are not convincing, and there is no clear example of such a use of the phrase (II. Chron. xxii. 11, cited by Hitzig, does not seem to me to sustain his point).

Of the prophet himself nothing is known. He is described as the son of Cushi, the son of Gedaliah, the son of Amariah, the son of Hizkiah (*i.q.*, Hezekiah). From this genealogy some have been inclined to consider him of royal blood, and a descendant of Hezekiah, King of Judah, the great-grandfather of Josiah. This can, however, be nothing more than a conjecture. More probably he was of priestly family, perhaps related to that Zephaniah, the son of Maaseiah, who was "second priest" at the time of the destruction of the Temple (II. Kings xxv. 18; Jer. xxi. 1, *al.*). For other instances of the name, all in the tribe of Levi, see I. Chron. vi. 36; Zech. vi. 10, 14.

In his prophecy, Zephaniah foretells the sure coming of the Day of Jehovah; *i.e.*, of Jehovah's triumph and vengeance. When it shall come, Jerusalem shall be destroyed and the land depopulated. The Philistines, Moab and Ammon, shall be utterly destroyed, and their land eventually possessed, by the remnant of Judah. The Ethiopians also shall be slain by the sword. Assyria shall be destroyed, and Nineveh be made a wilderness. But the prophecy is not without its brighter side and note of promise, and foretells that, after Jerusalem shall have been punished, a remnant shall still be left which shall return, and shall be richly blessed, and shall be made a name and a praise among all people. Such, very briefly epitomized, are the contents of the prophecy.

But the book also bears witness to the condition of the people at the time it was written, and we may find in it some facts in regard to the social and religious condition of the people at the time of Josiah's Reformation, not elsewhere given with equal explicitness. The writer was an ardent supporter of Jehovah, and as such was doubtless in thorough sympathy with the band of reformers, who were struggling against heathenism and idolatry, and the attendant and inseparable immorality. Very probably he was joined to them, also, by ties of blood; if of the royal seed, being related to Josiah; if, as is likely, his grandfather Amariah was the priest of that name in the reign of Hezekiah (II. Chron. xxxi. 15), he was nearly related to Hilkiyah and the other priestly reformers. It must always be remembered that Josiah's reformation was not at all a popular movement, but was carried with a high hand by the zealous and enthusiastic king, only to give place to a renewal of the former indifference and idolatry after his death at Hadad Rimmon. It is too much to say, as Wellhausen does ("Encyclop. Britt.," art. *Israel*), that the people observed the covenant during Josiah's lifetime. Such might be considered to have been the case were the books of Kings and Chronicles our

only sources of information, as the annalist, carried away by the last gleam of prosperity to the people, is oblivious to the darker shadows that were cast upon it. But in the prophecies of Zephaniah and Jeremiah, making all necessary allowance for the different standpoint of historian and preacher, we cannot fail to find unmistakable proof that the covenant was not adhered to even while Josiah was alive, but that it was openly as well as secretly violated by all classes among the people. The Hebrews, or rather the Jews, at that day were syncretists in their religion; it might have been said of them, as of their neighbors in Samaria, that they feared Jehovah and worshiped graven images at the same time; the priests were too often like Urijah in the reign of Ahaz, an hundred years before, pliant instruments of the will of a despotic king, and the prophets, with a few exceptions, made a trade of their prophetic powers, and were indifferent to the truth or falsity of their utterances. But a kernel of life was yet left in the nation; as in Israel in the days of Elijah, so now there were some faithful men who had not bowed the knee to Baal or given in their adhesion to the fashionable indifference or toleration; and now, having gained to their side the young and enthusiastic king, who had wished to serve Jehovah when he only knew him as the "God of David his father" (II. Chron. xxxiv. 3), and who now was devoted to His cause, they enlisted all his youthful vigor and all his unlimited royal power in a re-establishment of the worship of Jehovah, in greater glory than had been ever known. Great repairs were undertaken in the Temple, which had been alternately neglected by the better and pillaged by the worse of the various monarchs who had preceded Josiah, from the days of Rehoboam down. There was, indeed, a strange condition of affairs, the wrong and incongruity of which does not seem to have been fully appreciated even by the servants of Jehovah themselves. In the Temple Solomon had built to Jehovah, and which had been most solemnly dedicated to His glory, were contained at this time (II. Kings xxiii. 4, ff.) vessels made for Baal, and for the Asherah, and for all the host of heaven; and more than all this, even a "grove," or Asherah, a symbolical representation of the female divinity of the Canaanites. At the door of the Temple stood the horses consecrated to the sun, and chariots of the sun. By the side of the Temple were houses or stalls where male prostitutes plied their horrid trade, a part of the religious worship of the land. In the very courts of the Temple were altars for all the host of heaven, which Manasseh had made, and on the top of the upper chamber of Ahaz, other altars, which had been placed there by former kings of Judah. Such was

the condition of the Temple of Jehovah when the work of restoration began. And as it was defiled with these incongruous additions, so had it been despoiled of much that had made it rich and beautiful. The gold doors of the Temple, and the golden overlaid pillars, and all the silver in the Lord's house, had been given by Hezekiah to Sennacherib, as a bribe to purchase his favor (II. Kings xviii. 15, 16). Ahaz, the father of Hezekiah, had already sacrificed for a like purpose the borders of the bases, and the brazen oxen that held the brazen sea, and the "covert for the Sabbath," and the King's entry (II. Kings xvi. 17, 18). (The silver and gold of the Temple seem to have been commonly used for this purpose in times of need. Cf. I. Kings xv. 18; II. Kings xii. 18, xvi. 8, xviii. 15.) The Temple had been twice plundered by a foreign enemy: once by Shishak, King of Egypt, in the reign of Rehoboam (I. Kings xiv. 25, 26), and once by Jehoash, King of Israel, in the reign of Amaziah the son of Joash (II. Kings xiv. 14). It is true that devout monarchs had from time to time restored the building and lavished their treasures upon it (I. Kings xv. 15; II. Kings xii. 4-16, xv. 35), but the dilapidations had been far greater than the repairs, and its beauty and glory must have been greatly diminished.

And outside the Temple walls, the condition was a strange one for the capital city of the people of Jehovah, who had remained faithful to Him, and to the central sanctuary of His worship, when the Ten Tribes had withdrawn from their allegiance to the House of David. Idolatrous priests (כמרים) burned incense in the high places in the cities of Judah, and in the places round about Jerusalem; others burned incense to Baal, to the sun and to the moon, and to the planets and to all the host of heaven. In the valley of the children of Hinnom, immediately without the city wall, men made their children pass through the fire to Molech; and in the Mount of Olives were high places Solomon had built, where the worship of Ashtoreth and Chemosh and Milcom (probably identical with Molech) was carried on continually. And, as a hundred years before, in the days of Isaiah, so now were to be found, in both Judah and Jerusalem, workers with familiar spirits and wizards (II. Kings xxiii. 5, 10, 13, 24).

But, during the repairing of the House of Jehovah, Hilki'ah, the High Priest, made a discovery of momentous importance, which at once enlarged the scope and changed the character of the reformation (II. Kings xxii. 8). He found in the Temple, where it had lain

for ages, unnoticed and unheeded, if not unknown, the Book of the Law (ספר התורה).¹

This Sepher hatTorah was in all probability, judging from the effects produced, a copy of what is now known as the Book of Deuteronomy, or, at the least, of that portion of it that contains the covenant and the blessings and curses.

Some Scriptural critics have insinuated that Hilkiah only found what he had himself hidden, and that the book now found was a clumsy forgery, which yet imposed upon the king and the people. The view would be hardly deserving of notice, owing to its extreme improbability, had it not been put forward by men of unquestioned ability. Assuming, for the sake of argument, that Hilkiah and Shaphan and the prophets of Jehovah, the representatives and exponents of morality, and of morality as a part of religion, would be capable of such a fraud in the name of Jehovah, yet it is incredible that a fraud, that affected as this did so many and so diverse vested interests, should have been acquiesced in without resistance by those with whose long-established privileges it interfered. There was, as we shall see, a tacit resistance to the reformation, but no sign that the opponents of reform considered that they had been imposed on by a pretended document. The book evidently awakened old memories, and this was the secret of its power. Can we believe that, in the age of the highest bloom of Hebrew literature, there were not scribes among the opponents of Jehovah, as well as among His adherents, of sufficient literary ability to detect such a flagrant imposition as the critics would have us believe was practised upon them?

The effect upon the mind of the king was very great. He rent his clothes, and sent messengers to inquire of Jehovah concerning the words of the book; and, in spite of the words of doom, spoken in reply through the prophetess Huldah, he at once set about the work of reformation. This was, externally, thorough and sweeping. He removed all the abominations from the Temple and from Jerusalem and from the cities of Judah, going even outside the limits of his own kingdom, as far as Bethel and the cities of Samaria, upon the same

¹ The absence of the article from ספר does not warrant the translation of the phrase as simply "a law book." It is the universal rule that the definiteness of the absolute noun extends to the construct noun with which it is connected. Thus to take an instance from this very passage כִּנֵּית יְהוָה is not to be translated "in a house of Jehovah," but, as the construct word is rendered definite by the word that it limits, "in *the* house of Jehovah."

errand. After this was done, the Passover was celebrated in Jerusalem, according "as it is written in the book of this Covenant," in a manner that had not been seen in all the days of the kings of Israel, nor of the kings of Judah, nor since the days of the Judges. After this, Josiah's reign lasted for thirteen years, in which it is recorded of him that, "like unto him was there no king before him, that turned to Jehovah with all his heart and with all his soul and with all his might, according to all the laws of Moses; neither after him arose any like him" (II. Kings xxiii. 21-25). But his zeal led him into imprudently opposing Pharaoh Necho, King of Egypt, and he was slain at the battle of Megiddo; and after his death, although the worship of Jehovah continued, the abuses he had removed were in great measure brought back; and his reforms seem to have been forgotten except by the few faithful "servants of Jehovah," who kept their faith alive during the gloomy years of trouble and distress that followed, and who were to be the centre of life for the people in their captivity.

To gain a correct idea of the magnitude of the changes that the reform brought about, we must notice the length of time that the objectionable practices had been in existence. The "Grove," or Asherah figure, had been in the Temple of Jehovah certainly since the reign of Manasseh (II. Kings xxi. 3), at the very least reckoning twenty years, and possibly seventy-five; and the Asherah worship had been common in Judah since the reign of Rehoboam (B.C. 975-958), a period of three hundred and fifty years (I. Kings xiv. 23, xv. 13; II. Kings xviii. 4). The altars of Ahaz had been in the Temple over a hundred years (II. Kings xvi. 10-16). The worship of Baal was probably practised by the aboriginal Canaanite population of the land, but had been introduced from the neighboring kingdom of Israel as early as the reign of Jehoram, who married the daughter of Ahab and Jezebel, and who reigned in Judah B.C. 893-885 (II. Kings viii. 16-18); and, like the worship of the Asherah, it seems never to have been eradicated, though the best of the kings did not encourage it, and at this time it seems to have lost somewhat of its ancient popularity. The Sodomites are mentioned in the reign of Rehoboam (I. Kings xiv. 24), and as having been taken away out of the land by Asa (I. Kings xv. 12), whose reformation, which was, like that of Josiah, short-lived, was like it conducted on the lines marked out in Deuteronomy. The worship of the sun, and of the host of heaven, was practised by Manasseh (II. Kings xxi. 3) and probably by Ahaz, and the horses and chariots of the sun are mentioned as

having been the gifts of the "kings of Judah" (II. Kings xxiii. 11), as if the practice had been of long continuance. The worship of Jehovah on the high places had been practised certainly since the days of the Judges, and there is no record of its having been condemned by any recognized authority until the reign of Hezekiah. The statement in II. Chron. xiv. 3, 5, and xvii. 6, in regard to Asa and Jehoshaphat, are contradicted not only by the express statements in Kings, but by other statements of the chronicler himself (*cf.* II. Chron. xv. 17; I. Kings xv. 14; II. Chron. xx. 33; I. Kings xxii. 43).

The worship upon various high places seems to have been allowed and approved by the religious leaders of the people (I. Kings iii. 2). It was certainly practised by Samuel (I. Sam. ix. 12, 13, 14, 19, 25; x. 8; xi. 14, 15, *et al.*), by David (II. Sam. xxiv. 18-25), and even by Solomon (I. Kings iii. 3, 4); and these high places were never removed, according to the testimony of the Book of Kings, until the reign of Hezekiah, and were restored again immediately after his death. Their removal was at that time evidently a very unpopular measure, and we find Rabshakeh, the general of Sennacherib, making use of it as an argument to induce the people of Jerusalem to rebel against Hezekiah and make submission to his master (I. Kings xviii. 22, 25; II. Chron. xxxii. 10-12; Is. xxxvi. 7).¹

The high places of Chemosh, Ashtoreth, and Milcom had been standing in the midst of the people since the days of Solomon, some

¹ It would be beyond the purpose of this article to go to any great length into the question of the worship upon the high places. The considerations mentioned seem to conclusively prove the continued existence of the practice from the earliest times. A very ancient law (Ex. xx. 24-26) gave directions as to the way in which altars were to be made, and the prohibitions in Deut. xii. might easily have been understood to apply only to those high places which had been defiled by idolatrous worship. In the unsettled period of the Judges, attendance at a central sanctuary must at times have been impossible, though from I. Sam. i. 3, we see that it was practised. When the ark was in the hands of the Philistines, the sanctuary had lost its most sacred symbol, and it was not until the reign of David that anything like a central sanctuary again appears. It was most natural, then, that, notwithstanding the commands recorded in Deut. xii. had been given before the people crossed the Jordan, they should have been forgotten. Talmudic writers affirm that the law upon this subject did not apply until the Temple was built at Jerusalem. Even then the law could not have been generally or commonly known, as we find no sign that Jehoiada the priest, who was supreme during the minority of Joash, ever attempted to put down the worship, although he brought about the restoration of the Temple at Jerusalem and a revival of the worship and service of Jehovah (II. Kings xi., xii). *V.* article "Höhe," in Riehm's *Handwörterbuch d. Biblischen Altertums*.

four hundred years, as long a time as from the discovery of America until the present day ; but they seem to have been regarded as foreign chapels, which did not particularly concern the people of the land. Hence we may see that what Josiah did, in removing all these so long established institutions, was little short of an entire revolution, and was effected against the will of a very influential portion of the people, if not of an actual numerical majority. Jehovah was indeed the national God, but Baal and Asherah were the favorite divinities of a large part of the people, and had been the divinities of the Canaanites, the original inhabitants of the land, from whom the children of Israel had adopted many beliefs and customs. The Temple at Jerusalem was, indeed, recognized as the special throne of Jehovah, but the people were accustomed to their sacrifices in their own towns, or at the neighboring sanctuaries, and did not willingly yield to the demand of the more earnest worshippers of Jehovah, that the central sanctuary should be the only place where sacrifice should be offered. Accordingly, we find that when the movement lost the support and prestige of the royal power, it collapsed, and was not able to accomplish its purposes until the rigorous process of natural selection had picked out from the mass of the captive Judæans those few who were willing to return to their own land, and to establish there the commonwealth of Jehovah, and to live in obedience to His laws. The majority of the people either perished, or, like the ten tribes of Israel, were content to remain in the land of their exile, and to a great extent conformed to heathenism ; but the few, in whose hearts the leaven of the true faith in Jehovah and His righteousness had worked, returned, and established for the first time, in the full sense of the term, a commonwealth based expressly upon the detailed requirements of the Law of Moses.

In the prophecy of Zephaniah we find recorded several facts that will assist us to a fuller understanding of this period, some of which are not directly stated elsewhere. In ch. i. 4-6 we read : " I will also stretch out my hand upon Judah and upon all the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and I will cut off (1) the remnant of Baal from this place, and (2) the name of the Chemarim with (3) the priests, and (4) them that worship the host of heaven upon the housetops, and them (5) that worship and swear allegiance to Jehovah, and (or *yet*) swear by Malcham (*i.g.*, Milcom, Molech), and (6) those that are turned back from Jehovah, and (7) those who have not sought Jehovah, nor inquired for him."

Here we see that (1) vengeance is proclaimed against the remnant

of Baal (*cf.* II. Kings xxiii. 4), an expression which, though sometimes considered to indicate that this form of idolatry was not the leading or principal one, as in Israel under Ahab, but was an old worship which yet had some adherents in Jerusalem, yet more probably indicates that at the time of the prophet's utterance, in spite of Josiah's strongest measures, there were still left some remnant who remained faithful to their idolatrous worship. (2) The Chemarim are mentioned in II. Kings xxiii. 5 as being the priests whom the kings of Judah had ordained to burn incense in the high places in the cities of Judah and in the places round about Jerusalem. The word is an Aramaic one, and is, in Syriac, the common one for priest. In Hebrew it is used always in a bad sense of priests of a religion other than that of Jehovah. *Cf.* Hosea x. 5 (*cf. per contra* Keil *in loco*).¹ They are here clearly distinguished from (3) the Cohanim, by whom are meant the Levitical priests of the high places, who were degraded from their office, yet allowed to eat of the hallowed food of the Sanctuary (II. Kings xxiii. 8, 9). These were worshippers of Jehovah; the Chemarim, on the other hand, were probably priests of images. Both Chemarim and Cohanim are threatened with destruction. (4) Those who worship the "host of heaven" are also denounced (*cf.* II. Kings xxiii. 4, 5, 11). (5) "Those who swear allegiance to Jehovah, yet swear by Malcham" (their king). In the Hebrew there is an evident contrast between the expression "swear to" (נִשְׁבַּע לֵ) and "swear by" (נִשְׁבַּע בִּ), and the entire force of the passage is lost if we omit to distinguish between them, as is done in the A. V. The persons denounced under this title are evidently priests of Jehovah, who, in spite of their pretended allegiance to Him, are, in reality, believers in and worshippers of Molech. (It is possible also to consider the passage as referring to those who made their king's (מֶלֶכָם) will the measure of their devotion, who, in order to please Josiah, had taken the covenant with Jehovah, but who were ready to apostasize should that be the pleasure of his successors. Such men have existed in all ages of the world, and were plentiful at the period under consideration, as is shown both by what Josiah was able to accomplish and also by what he failed to do.) (6, 7) The next two classes include all opponents of Jehovah among the people, viz., those who have been His worshippers, and who have forsaken Him, and those who have always

¹ The word literally means *dark robed, clad in mourning*, thus contrasting strongly with the white robes of the Levitical Priests and the gorgeous vestments of the High Priest.

lived in heathenism and indifference, "them that are turned back from Jehovah," *i.e.*, those who have relapsed into idolatry, and "those that have not sought Jehovah, nor enquired of (A. V. *for*) Him." "Seeking Jehovah" means to worship Him, to turn to Him especially with prayer and supplication. Cf. Ex. xxxiii. 7; II. Chron. xx. 4; Ps. xl. 17, lxix. 7, cv. 3; Is. li. 1. **דרש את יהוה**, which should here be rendered "enquire of Jehovah," not "enquire for," is a very common expression, and means simply to seek Jehovah, to go to Him, and have recourse to Him for aid. Cf. II. Chron. xvi. 12; Deut. iv. 29; Ps. xxxiv. 5, lxxxviii. 34; Lam. iii. 25, *et al.* It is often used to denote the habitually pious, and is then equivalent to *worship* or *adore*. V. Ps. xiv. 2, ix. 11, xxii. 7, xxxiv. 11; Is. lviii. 2, *et al.*

In face of an opposition, that was evidently murmuring loudly, if not actually complaining, in regard to customs which, from their standpoint, were innovations, the prophet continues: "Hold thy peace at the presence of Adonai Jehovah, for the day of Jehovah is at hand; for Jehovah hath prepared a sacrifice, He hath bid His guests. And it shall come to pass in the day of Jehovah's sacrifice, that I will punish (8) the princes and (9) the king's children, and (10) all such as are clothed with strange apparel."

He foretells, in other words, that when the day of vengeance comes, these, who are at present escaping punishment, will receive their deserts. (8) First among these come the princes (**שרים**). These were the high officials of the kingdom, men of station and influence, and generally connected with the court. Cf. II. Sam. xviii. 5; I. Kings iv. 2; Job xxix. 9, xxxiv. 19; Is. xxx. 4; Jer. xxvi. 11 sq., xxxvii. 14 sq., *et al.* They seem to have formed a hereditary aristocracy in Judah and Jerusalem, and to have been divided upon the subject of religion. In the accounts given in Kings and Chronicles of reformation, we have no mention of any opposition. It is said the people "stood to the covenant," *i.e.*, "consented to it." Nothing in regard to the attitude of the nobles is thus recorded. From this passage, however, we learn that there was a powerful, if not an active opposition, and may understand how easily the good work became undone after the influence of the royal favor was removed. In the reign of Jehoiakim we find the "Sarim" preserving Jeremiah from the ignorant rage of the priests and people. This, however, does not show that they were upon the side of Jehovah, but rather the contrary, as the priests and people were, on that occasion, attacking Jeremiah because they considered him a traitor to Jehovah. On the other hand, when Urijah, the son of Shemaiah, of Kirjath Jearim (possibly one of their own

number), repeated Jeremiah's prophecy, we find the princes co-operating with the king to put him to death, and also learn that it was only by the kind offices of Ahikam, the son of Shaphan, that Jeremiah escaped a similar fate (Jer. xxvi.). In Jer. xxxvi. the princes seem to have formed a council for the transaction of public business, and to have met in the "scribe's chamber" in the king's house, and to have considered that they were obliged to take cognizance of Jeremiah's book, which had been read by Barach. The majority of the princes, on this occasion, were against Jehovah; only Delaiah, the son of Shemaiah (perhaps brother to the dead Urijah), and Gemariah, the son of Shaphan (the brother of the Ahikam, who had, four years before, befriended Jeremiah), and Elnathan, the son of Achbor (who, on the former occasion, had been the instrument of the purposes of the impious king), only these three seem to have been touched in their consciences by the words of the prophet speaking in Jehovah's name. All the princes, however, seem, as in the previous case, to have had some personal regard for Jeremiah, and sent him warning to hide himself from the king's anger.

In the reign of Zedekiah, the princes appear to have deteriorated in character. This may be explained by the fact that the best of them had been carried captive with Jehoiachin (Jer. xxiv. 1-7). We read that they beat and imprisoned Jeremiah on suspicion of being about to desert to the Chaldeans (Jer. xxxvii. 13-15). When Zedekiah had given him some degree of liberty, they persuaded him to give orders for his death; and when the weak king yielded to their demands, they cast the prophet into the dungeon of Malchiah, into the mire (Jer. xxxviii.).

When Zedekiah proclaimed the emancipation of all Jewish slaves, the princes only pretended compliance, and afterwards re-enslaved all their former bondmen and bondwomen (Jer. xxxiv.). Finally, Ishmael, of the seed royal, and ten of the princes of the king with him, assassinated Gedaliah, the son of Ahikam, the son of Shaphan, whom Nebuchadnezzar had made governor over the land (Jer. xli.). We may notice that Shaphan,—the scribe in Josiah's reign,—and most of his descendants, seem to have been faithful adherents of Jehovah (see, for a probable exception, Ezekiel viii. 11).

Shaphan, it will be remembered, was the person to whom Hilkiah the priest first communicated the news of the discovery of the Book of the Law (II. Kings xxii.), and he was, undoubtedly, among the leading reformers. The majority of the princes, however, appear to have been irreligious, not caring very much either for Jehovah or Baal,

so long as they could enjoy their own wealth and privileges. Isaiah describes the princes of his time as "rebellious, and companions of thieves" (Is. i. 23). Jeremiah says of them, in a prophecy uttered in the reign of Josiah, "that they have altogether broken the yoke and burst the bonds" (v. 5); that, "as a cage is full of birds, so are their houses full of deceit; therefore, they are become great, and waxen rich. They are waxed fat, they shine; yea, they overpass the deeds of the wicked; they judge not the cause, the cause of the fatherless, and the right of the needy do they not judge" (Jer. v. 27, 28). Ezekiel bears the same testimony in similar words (Ezek. xxii. 6, 27). From our author we learn that they were opposed to the reformation, and that they were violent and oppressive (Zeph. iii. 3). (9) The "*King's Children*" are further mentioned as objects for the divine vengeance. The fate of Jehoahaz (Shallum), Jehoiakim, and Jehoiachin affords the commentary upon this prophecy. They re-established evil customs as soon as their father was dead, and though, in the day of vengeance, they called upon Jehovah, it was too late.

(10) "All such as are clothed in strange apparel" refers to those who put on the sacred robes or vestments used in the worship of the foreign divinities. Cf. Ezek. xiii. 18-21; II. Kings x. 22. Keil considers the expression to refer simply to those who adopted foreign fashions, but the supposition is hardly probable at this period of the people's history. The strong opposition between Jew and Gentile was of later date. The sin which is denounced by Zephaniah in his whole prophecy is apostasy from Jehovah, or hostility towards His worship, and it is for some form of this that we are to look in this passage.

In II. Kings x. 22, referred to above, the word here translated "apparel" is used of the sacred vestments worn by the worshippers of Baal.

(11) The next class denounced is made up of "those who leap upon the threshold, which fill their masters' houses with violence and deceit." This phrase may be rendered "leap above" or "over the threshold," and in this case may refer to the worshippers of the Philistine divinity, Dagon, who, we learn from I. Sam. x. 5, had this peculiar custom. The second clause, "they that fill their masters' houses with violence and deceit," is hard to explain. At first sight it would seem simply to refer to slaves who committed frauds and robberies for their masters' benefit. But the whole connection is with forms of religious error, and the words evidently describe some further characteristics of "those who leap upon the threshold." It may be that the

worshippers of Dagon, or of some other of the heathen divinities, practised these crimes as a religious ceremony, as the Thugs in India used to murder as an offering to their goddess. An allusion to some such practice as this is probably contained in Jer. vii. 8-10, where stealing and murder and adultery are mentioned in connection with the worship of false gods, and excused by the performers upon the ground that "they were delivered" to do these things; *i.e.*, either that these ceremonies formed their ground of hope for deliverance from danger, or that they had been delivered from danger in order that they might show their gratitude by these acts. The verb used, נָצַל cannot be understood as it is frequently by expounders of this passage, *permitted* or *given over to perform* these actions, but means here, as elsewhere, deliverance from danger. Should we translate אֲרִיָּהִים as a plural of excellence, and understand it as corresponding to Baalim as a title, the sense suggested is still more apparent. That the word, Adon, was used as a divine appellation by heathen as well as Hebrew, is clear from the Phœnician Adonis.

Chapter ii. 4-7 shows us that the Philistines were still a powerful evil in the land. On these grounds it seems best to consider the entire passage as referring to the worshippers of Dagon and the evil customs connected with the *cultus* of that divinity.

In vv. 10, 11, there is probably some special connection between the places mentioned, as singled out for distinction, and idolatrous practices by which they had been defiled, but our information is too scanty to determine what it is. The "Fish Gate," which is mentioned in II. Chron. xxxiii. 14; Neh. iii. 3, xii. 39, was a gate on the southern side of the city near the western wall. From II. Kings xxiii. 8 we learn that it was not unusual for city gates to have "high places" upon them or near them.

The "second" does not mean the second gate, but the second ward or quarter of the city. It is the same word that is used in II. Kings xxii. 14 to describe the dwelling-place of Huldah the prophetess, and is there translated "*college*." The "hills" refer, probably, to the city of David and the Temple hills, so that the three places cited really include nearly the whole city. Maktesh was a valley near the city, so called from its mortar-like shape. Nothing is known of it; its inhabitants, from this passage, seem to have been traders, perhaps sellers of supplies to those sacrificing to the various divinities.

To all these places doom is announced, "crying" and "howling" and "a great crashing"; "the merchant people are cut down, all they that bear silver are cut off."

Thus far the prophet has denounced the active foes of Jehovah, who openly served other gods and opposed the reformation. In v. 12 he comes to the class of the neutral and indifferent,—those whose care was for themselves, and who regretted the stir and turmoil of the new movement, and had no confidence in its success. His language is striking and most forcible: “And it shall come to pass, in that day, that I will search Jerusalem with candles, and punish the men that are settled on their lees, that say in their heart, Jehovah will not do good, neither will he do evil.” The phrase, “settled upon their lees,” means, “have lived a quiet, undisturbed life, of indifference and sloth.” Cf. Jer. xlviii. 11. The figure is taken from wine that has been allowed to stand a long while without disturbance, and which has deposited a good deal of sediment. This needs to be kept quiet and undisturbed, to be clear; if agitated, the sediment rises, and the wine becomes turbid, and its quality is impaired.

From the prophet's words we may gather that the well-to-do class of Jerusalem, who were prosperous and comfortable, and who did not seriously trouble themselves about religion of any kind, resented, or at least opposed a passive resistance to the *new* laws, as they undoubtedly seemed to them, and to the new notions about righteousness and moral qualifications being necessary for worshippers of Jehovah. “Who is Jehovah,” they would enquire, “that he should make such claims upon us, claims that have never been made before? We have lived in this state for centuries, and only began to be troubled when Hezekiah began to stir up dissension and dissatisfaction by removing the high places to which the people were accustomed.” They would argue with a specious force that the worship of Jehovah and the casting out of Baal had not profited the neighboring kingdom, although since the days of Jehu, Jehovah had been the God of Samaria, He had not saved it from the Assyrian. “Why all this commotion and excitement, this overstrained repentance, this impossible covenant, this exaggerated Passover? Jehovah has never done and will never do us any good, nor has he done, nor will he do, any evil. There is no reason for fear, no cause for terror.” These were the Epicureans of the day, who did not believe that the gods trouble themselves about the world. They were the quiet, conservative, moneyed interest, whose motto then as in all ages of the world was, “*Quieta non movere*.” And for this they are here denounced by the single-hearted and devoted prophet, as the foes of Jehovah.

From chap. iii. we find that besides these obstacles to reformation, the moral condition of Jerusalem was such that punishment was sure

to come ; and that, as far as morals went, the reformation had been practically fruitless. Here must, of course, be borne in mind that the fact alluded to before, that Zephaniah is not an annalist, but an indignant moralist and preacher of righteousness, rebuking the people for sin, and for rebellion against Jehovah, and that hence it is only to be expected that he will paint the sin of the people in its blackest hue. Much that the simple historian of the period would pass by, appears to the prophet as abomination, sure to bring upon the city the vengeance of Jehovah.

Hence, for a correct appreciation of the period, we need to take a mean between the annalist and the prophet, accepting, however, all the facts stated by the prophet as facts ; for appeals to the conscience that were based upon incorrect facts, and of which the errors could be easily exposed, would have been worse than futile.

His picture of the degraded city doomed to destruction is as follows :

“Woe to her that is filthy and polluted, the oppressing city ! She obeyed not the voice ; she received not correction ; she trusted not in Jehovah ; she drew not near to her God. Her princes within her are roaring lions ; her judges are ravening wolves, they gnaw not the bones till the morrow ; her prophets are light and treacherous persons ; her priests have polluted the sanctuary, they have done violence to the Law.” In spite of the word of Jehovah in their midst, in spite of the warning given them in the fate of other nations, the people had refused to receive instruction, but “they rose early and corrupted their doings.” On this account punishment must come, and their pride be humbled, and the false confidence which they had in Jehovah as their national God be destroyed.

Neither outwardly nor inwardly had the reformation been a success. It had been violent and sweeping like that of Jehu in Samaria, but like it its work was imperfect. Indeed, it seems to have had even less permanent effect than that of Jehu. Though an outward conformity had been for a time attained, though the temple of Baal had been destroyed, the “high places” removed, and the “groves” cut down, yet the spirit of indifference and the love of the lax morality of heathenism, which had underlain all the forms of unlawful worship, was not removed.

In spite of the burning words of the prophet, in spite of the royal example, in spite of the teachings of the Book of the Law, — so long forgotten, now once again made known to the people, — they preferred their own way, and, as their own wise sage had said, “were filled with the fruit of their own devices” ; and, going on from bad to worse, ripened gradually for destruction.

From our examination of the portions of his prophecy that concern Judah and Jerusalem, we have seen that we have from Zephaniah the following facts, in regard to the condition of religion and morality in the latter part of the reign of Josiah, after the great reformation had begun. Some, though not all, of these facts can be inferred from the language of Jeremiah.

In spite of all that had been done, there were still to be found in the city: (1) a remnant of Baal; (2) Chemarim and (3) rebellious Cohanim; (4) worshippers of the Host of Heaven; (5) secret worshippers of Molech; (6) renegades from Jehovah, (7) and some who had never yielded themselves to His service. These all are to be "cut off" and "destroyed" in the "Day of Jehovah."

Besides these there is a second class, made up of the chief obstacles in the way of reformation, who are to be punished in the day of Jehovah's sacrifice. Their fate, though described in different words, is none the less terrible than that of the former class. These obstacles, in the way of reformation, are: (8) the Princes, the Sarim (שרים); (9) the King's Sons (בני המלך); (10) the wearers of strange (foreign) apparel, *i.e.* sacrificers to foreign divinities; (11) "those who leap upon the threshold" (probably those who have adopted the worship of the Philistine Dagon), "which fill their master's house with violence and deceit" (probably those who rob and steal to fill their Lord's (ארניהם) house with offerings); (12) the merchants and traders as a source of foreign corruption; (13) the indifferent who are "settled upon their lees," and who are incredulous as to the power of Jehovah, "who say Jehovah will not do good, neither will He do evil."

To these elements of religious opposition are to be added the elements of moral degradation among the people. There were two main points in Jehovah's reformation, as in the prophetic teaching upon which it was based: (1) Jehovah, and none else, was to be worshipped, and He, so far as sacrifices were concerned, only in Jerusalem; (2) Jehovah was the God of righteousness and morality. This second point was as strongly insisted upon by the prophets as the first.

Hence we find Zephaniah giving a dreadful description of the moral condition of the people, although from the accounts of the annalists in Kings and Chronicles, we should suppose that the reformation was successful. He tells us (1) of the existence of a generally degraded moral condition among the people (iii. 1); (2) of the rejection of the call to righteousness (iii. 2); (3) of the evil character of the

princes and judges (iii. 3) ; (4) of the instability and treachery of the prophets (iii. 4, *a*, cf. Zech. xiii. 2-6) ; (5) of the moral degradation of the priests and the disrepute they brought upon the Law of God (iii. 4, *b*) ; (6) and that, in spite of the corruption, pride was felt in belonging to Jehovah, and a false confidence in the protecting power of the "sanctuary of the holy mountain" (iii. 11).

With these elements of opposition to Jehovah and of moral corruption remaining in the land, it is indeed no wonder that, as soon as Josiah died, a counter revolution should have set in. Yet, strangely enough, the impulse given to the outward worship of Jehovah does not seem lost. In the subsequent reigns, He was worshipped very generally, if not earnestly or intelligently, by the people ; and, as we have seen, Jeremiah was considered a traitor to Him, when he prophesied that His holy city should have the fate of Shiloh. The ritual was kept up, daily ascended the fragrance of the incense and the smoke of the holocausts ; although, in the very chambers of the same Temple, men who worshipped Jehovah at one hour, adored at another "all the idols of the host of Israel." There were a few who remained true to the grand ideal ; noble youths like Daniel and his three comrades in Babylon, princes like Gedaliah, priests like Ezekiel and Jeremiah. These constituted the remnant of Judah, the kernel of life that should spring up into vigorous growth after the captivity, and which should build up a community where the law of the Lord, which men now rejected, should be the one and only rule of life. These were the "servants of Jehovah," the types of the great "Servant of Jehovah," for whom they were preparing the way. Like Him they were "despised and rejected of men, men of sorrows and acquainted with grief," from whom men turned away their faces. And like Him "they bore the griefs and carried the sorrows" of their people. They were "wounded for their transgressions," they were "bruised for their iniquities," bore uncomplainingly the chastisement that should bring peace to their people, and the stripes which should prove their healing. They were the few who "knew Jehovah," and who knew Him to be the Eternal and Righteous God, and their faith and their endurance in the midst of seeming failure won, by God's help, the victory. It is a striking thought that, while the power and might of Josiah, and his forcible methods, were fruitless, the quiet influence of the faithful few preserved, in the long years of exile, the national existence as well as the national religion ; and while powerful Israel never returned, but passed easily from its impure form of worship into the idolatries of the land of captivity, the remnant of Judah, strong in

the faith of the righteous Jehovah, who might be worshipped with sacrifices only in Jerusalem, was strong enough, after seventy years probation, to return and establish once more the theocracy, in which the Law of Jehovah was at once, as the poet sang, "a lantern unto their feet and a light unto their paths." Towards this consummation the prophet Zephaniah performed his allotted part, delivered his message, and has, in his recorded prophecy, left it as a graphic picture of the condition of his country and countrymen.

In his day, even those who worshipped Jehovah had not learned the lesson of righteousness and morality ; and, in spite of their wickedness, yet rejoiced in the pride of the city, and were haughty because of the holy mountain of God. He looked forward, by faith, to the change that would come in time, after God's judgment had been executed upon the guilty land ; when, though the people should be poor and afflicted, and but a remnant of the old glory, they should trust in the name of Jehovah.

The contrast between Zephaniah and the annalists, which is a contrast only, and not a contradiction, is as marked as his exact correspondence and agreement with Jeremiah in almost every point. Any study of the history of the times that will simply follow the annalists and neglect the prophetic testimony, must necessarily be incomplete and convey an incorrect impression of the condition of affairs.

Notes.

Modern Chapters and Verses.

PROF. I. H. HALL, PH.D.

IN the matter of the Modern Chapters and Verses, one point seems to have escaped modern notice. (See generally my article *Chapters and Verses, Modern*, in Schaff's Herzog's *Cyclopædia*.) That is, the fact that, although the Arabic numerals were first printed in the margin of a Hebrew Bible in 1660, at the instance of John Leusden, an attempt was begun at the same thing in the Hebrew Bible of Plantinus, small 8vo, Antwerp, 1574. In this volume, every fifth verse is marked with Hebrew numerals, after the fashion already long in vogue; but the first 16 pages (that is, the first sheet) has also the Arabic numerals in the margin, opposite the beginning of each verse, like the modern Hebrew Bibles. The last verse thus numbered is Genesis xxxi. 4, verse 5 beginning the next page.

After I had discovered this fact for myself, I found that it was noted in Masch's *Le Long*, Pars i., Cap. i., Sect. i., § xxxvi. 1., as follows: "Capita et versus Judæorum more sunt distincti; at in prima codicis plagula singulis commatibus numerus arabicus in margine est adscriptus." Whether the other Plantin Bible of the same date (also 1573), in smaller form, has the same phenomenon or not I am unable to say; though Masch says, "Altera editio in forma minori ab hac non nisi forma differt." The only copy of that edition, which is ordinarily accessible to me, is at present boxed up. But the Plantin Peshitto Syriac New Testament of both forms, — the first, (about) 1573; the second, 1575, — have the Arabic verse-numbers in the margin.

Also, though in the New Testament the modern verses were made by Robert Stephen for his Latin Concordance of 1555, and are commonly reported to have been *first used for reference* in that book, the fact is that the first references made by the modern verse-numbers appear in the marginal references of his first New Testament divided into verses (1551), in the "Index" of the same, and in the "Harmonia Evangelica" which forms a part of the second volume of the same.

The caption of the "Index" is worth quoting as the first literary record on the subject: "Index eorum quae in Novo Testamento docentur. Primus numerus, caput: alter, versum significat."

Αἰώνιος, II. *Cor.* iv. 17 and v. 1.

REV. W. H. COBB.

THESE three consecutive verses refute the theory that αἰώνιος is not a time-word, as distinctly as though they were written with that object in view. In iv. 17 we find the following contrasts:—

θλίψεως	δόξης
ελαφρόν	βάρος
παραντίκα	αἰώνιον.

The A. V. renders παραντίκα "but for a moment." Similarly the R. V. "for the moment." The contrast holds αἰώνιον strictly to the sense "everlasting." The next verse gives two more oppositions:—

τὰ βλεπόμενα	τὰ μὴ βλεπόμενα
πρόσκαιρα	αἰώνια.

Both versions render "temporal" and "eternal." Alford brings out the contrast still more sharply: "not '*temporal*,' 'belonging to time,' but '*fleeting*,' 'only for a time.'"

Following the etymology of πρόσκαιρος, I should translate thus: "the things that are seen are *for a season*, but the things that are not seen are *for ever*."

The apostle still pursues his contrasts in the verse that follows, v. 1:—

οἰκία τοῦ σκήνους	οἰκίαν ἀχειροποίητον
ἐπίγειος	ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς
καταλυθῇ	αἰώνιον.

Both versions render "dissolved" and "eternal." Αἰώνιον therefore = ἀκατάλυτον, indestructible, *i.e.* never-ending. There is no important variation in the Greek authorities for the above verses. Either of them singly witnesses for the temporal sense of αἰώνιος; as combined in immediate succession, the testimony has great force. No doubt it is possible to evade this force; and, indeed, if the Bible had said, in so many words, "eternal punishment is endless," the obvious comment would be: "that is, it has nothing to do with *end*;" it pertains to a sphere where the terms 'beginning' and 'end' have no meaning."

Matt. xii. 43-45.

PROF. E. P. GOULD.

THE form of this statement, in both Matthew and Luke (xi. 24-26), makes our Lord say that the disastrous result takes place whenever the unclean spirit leaves a man. The condition of all that follows is found in that one act of leaving. This is manifestly absurd, and the only way to get rid of the absurdity is to extend the conditional part of the statement through verse 44, so that it will read, "Whenever the unclean spirit has gone out from the man, and goes through waterless places, seeking rest and finding it not; and it says, I will return into my house, whence I came out; and having come, it finds it empty, swept and garnished; then it goes and takes with it seven other spirits, more evil than itself, and having entered, they dwell there, and that man's last condition becomes worse than the first." That is, the thing which determines the spirit's return is that he finds the house unoccupied, and the lesson is that a man must not only expel his evil spirits, but fill himself with good ones. But it does not follow that the house is left empty whenever the evil spirit departs. Or the statement may be left as it is, simply introducing a conditional particle before *εὑρίσκει* in verse 44, so that it will read, "and having come, if it finds it empty." What is wanted is to make this one thing, on which evidently the result depends, contingent.

It has occurred to the writer that the evident misplacing of the connectives in the Greek gospels may have arisen from the use of the simple connectives in the Aramaic speech of Jesus. There, the simple copulative conjunctions being used, the logical connections of the several statements are not indicated, but left to be implied from the nature of the whole and the evident relations of the parts. Then, in transferring it into Greek, it is easy to see how the proper connection of the parts may have been missed.

Proceedings.

THE seventh meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis occurred, according to appointment, in the Library of the Berkeley Divinity School, Middletown, Conn., at 2.30 P.M., June 5th, 1883.

There were present Profs. Beecher, Bissell, Briggs; Rev. W. H. Cobb; Profs. Dwight, Ferguson, Gardiner, Gould, Hall; Rev. Drs. Hibbard, Jewett; Rev. R. W. Micou; Prof. Mitchell; Rev. Dr. Mombert; Profs. Prentice and Schaff.

In the absence of the President and Vice-President, Prof. Dwight was chosen President *pro tem*.

The minutes of the last meeting were read and approved.

The committee of arrangements announced that they had appointed, subject to the approval of the Society, a recess from 6 to 7.30 P.M., to be followed by the transaction of the business of the Society and the election of officers, and then by the hour for short notes. Also another session at 9 A.M. the following day.

The report was accepted and the arrangement adopted.

It was voted that the President be requested to appoint a committee to nominate officers. He subsequently appointed as such committee, Profs. Beecher, Bissell, and Gardiner.

At 3.10 the first paper was read by Prof. C. A. Briggs, D.D., on "The Argument *E Silentio*." It occupied until 4.07, and was discussed until the recess.

On assembling at 7.30, in the absence of Prof. Dwight, Prof. Beecher was chosen President *pro tem*.

Letters of regret at unavoidable absence from many members were read.

The Council reported that they had fixed upon New York as the place, and the Christmas holidays as the time, of the next meeting; the day and room to be determined by a Committee, consisting of Drs. Short, Briggs, and Schaff.

The Council recommended that the price of the Journal for 1881 be fixed at \$1 to members elected since its publication. This recommendation was adopted by vote of the Society.

The Council at this time, and on the following morning, recommended the following persons for election as members : —

Rev. S. J. Andrews,	Hartford, Conn.
Prof. George F. Moore,	Andover, Mass.
“ Frank E. Woodruff,	“ “
“ Edward Y. Hinks,	“ “
“ John P. Taylor,	“ “
Rev. C. R. Gillet,	Union Theol. Sem., New York.
“ Newman Smythe, D.D.,	New Haven, Conn.
“ James R. Riggs,	Cranford, N.J.
Prof. F. A. Gast,	Theol. Sem. of German Ref'd Ch., Lancaster, Pa.
“ Jas. C. Van Benschoten,	
LL.D.,	Middletown, Conn.

And they were thereupon duly elected.

The Committee on the Nomination of Officers made their report, and it was laid on the table until the following morning.

The Treasurer's report was presented and also postponed, the President having, on motion, appointed an auditing committee, consisting of Profs. Prentice and Gould.

At 8.30 short notes were given as follows : —

By Prof. Hall, on the notation of verses in the Hebrew Bible.

By Rev. W. H. Cobb, on the title **אל תשחח** in the Psalms.

“ “ “ on *aíwviov* as a time-word.

By Rev. Dr. Mombert, on Tyndale's Pentateuch.

By Prof. Gould, on Matt. xii. 43.

By Rev. Dr. Jewett, on the Samaritan and Arabic words for “to create.”

These notes, and the discussion upon them, having occupied until 10 P.M., the Society adjourned to 9 A.M. on Wednesday.

Wednesday, the Society reassembled at 9 A.M.

The Treasurer's report was read, showing a balance of \$344.93 in the treasury. The report was accepted and referred to the Auditing Committee.

The Auditing Committee reported, after having examined the report and vouchers, and found everything correct.

The death of the Rev. Dr. Krauth, Provost of the University of Pennsylvania, since the last meeting, was announced.

Tributes were paid to the memory of Dr. Krauth by Drs. Schaff, Mombert, and Hall, Rev. W. H. Cobb, and others.

The report of the Committee on the Nomination of Officers was taken up.

The Committee nominated the former officers (with the exception of the Secretary, who was unable to serve longer, and Prof. Mead, who was absent from the country), and they were elected as follows : —

REV. D. R. GOODWIN, D.D., LL.D.	<i>President.</i>
REV. JAMES STRONG, D.D., LL.D.	<i>Vice-President.</i>
REV. H. G. MITCHELL, Ph.D.	<i>Secretary.</i>
REV. C. A. BRIGGS, D.D.	<i>Treasurer.</i>
REV. EZRA ABBOT, D.D., LL.D.,	} <i>Additional Members of the Council.</i>
REV. GEO. E. DAY, D.D.,	
REV. TIMOTHY DWIGHT, D.D.,	
PROF. CHARLES SHORT, LL.D.,	
REV. E. C. BISSELL, D.D.,	

Prof. E. P. Gould read the next paper, beginning at 10 A.M., on "The Argument of Romans ix.-xi.," and occupied until 11. This paper was dicussed until 11.40, when further discussion was postponed until after the reading of the next paper.

At 11.40 the last paper was read by Prof. Henry Ferguson, occupying until 12.25, on "The Prophet Zephaniah and his Times." This was discussed until 12.40, when

After the reading of the rough minutes, at 12.53, the Society adjourned.

FREDERIC GARDINER,
Secretary.

DECEMBER.

The Independent Legislation of Deuteronomy.

PROF. E. C. BISSELL, D.D.

THE importance of the Book of Deuteronomy in all discussions touching the age and origin of the Pentateuch cannot well be over-estimated. Leading critics, indeed, like De Wette¹ and Graf,² have regarded it as decisive battle-ground. Lying in the midst of the supposed development of Pentateuchal literature from Moses to Ezra, it ought to show, if it appear anywhere, positive evidence of the evolution then in progress. It ought to show this especially in its legislation, which, as the name "Deuteronomy" imports, forms the body, and is undoubtedly the main object of the work. It ought to show it most of all in such laws as are original with this book, and intrinsically represent it.

It is said of the Pentateuchal codes in general that they but reflect, in their several parts, the changing social and ethical standard of the Hebrew people during many hundred years previous to the Exile. If this be true, and they are in no sense ideal or prophetic in character,

¹ *Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung*. Neu bearbeitet von Schrader, Berlin, 1869, pp. 322 ff., 322 ff.; and *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1837, p. 953: "The view taken of Deuteronomy is for the criticism of the Pentateuch decisive."

² *Die Geschichtlichen Bücher des Alten Testaments*, p. 4 f.; cf. also Kleinert, *Das Deuteronomium*, p. 3: "Denn zwar dieses erkennt De Wette an, und hat damit für seine Nachfolger einen Fingerzeig gegeben, dessen Nichtbeachtung fast immer der kritischen Untersuchung zur Schädigung gereicht hat: dass in dem Deuteronomium das *δὸς μοι τοῦ στῶ* für die ganze kritische Frage über den Pentateuch gegeben ist." Wellhausen, on the other hand, with a good deal of unnecessary bravado, rules the whole matter out of the discussion as something already settled. He says (*Geschichte*, p. 9): "Ueber den Ursprung des Deuteronomiums herrscht noch weniger Zweifel; in allen Kreisen, wo überhaupt auf Anerkennung wissenschaftlicher Resultate zu rechnen ist, wird anerkannt, dass es in der Zeit verfasst ist, in der es entdeckt . . . wurde."

the peculiar product of a superhuman revelation, or inspiration at the genesis, and throughout the progress of a much more limited development, the fact should appear most plainly, not in the features that are common to all of them, but rather in such as are exceptional and individual. There are some laws, as for example that regarding public worship, or that of the feasts, which, in a form more or less modified, appear in each of the three great divisions of the Pentateuchal legislation. In such cases there is ample room for discussion, in fact, imperative need of it, on a host of questions quite apart from the main question. It must first of all be determined whether these diverse forms are, as alleged, the result of widely varying circumstances of place and time, or may fairly be regarded as evidence simply of another point of view within the same period, and on the part of the same legislator. Where, however, a law is found in but one of these divisions, and in but one form, the area of debatable ground is greatly lessened. We are then prepared at once to test our critical theory concerning the age of the document, and to do it under circumstances of the least embarrassment.

Now, it is well known that no inconsiderable portion of the Deuteronomic laws are of this character. And it is a highly significant fact in itself, since it is just what we might expect on the traditional hypothesis, that this code chronologically concludes the legislation of the Pentateuch. But it is also of value as furnishing a capital opportunity to prove the validity of a favorite tenet of many modern critics.

Out of the full score of these early laws original with Deuteronomy, and confined to it, there are some, it is true, of such a nature that a chronological test can only with difficulty be applied to them. But with the majority it is quite otherwise. Their response to such a test is both immediate and categorically direct. The only question remaining to be asked, *i.e.*, for those who will press a question of this sort, is whether these laws are seriously meant, or, like the so-called "Blue Laws" of Connecticut, are but *quasi* statutes, whose originator was satisfied if they were founded on fact, and were not easily distinguishable from fact.

The first example of a law peculiar to Deuteronomy is that concerning *seduction to idolatry*. It occupies the entire thirteenth chapter, and appears in three sections: (1) as applying to false prophets (vv. 2-6); (2) to individual members of the community whom it rigorously singles out from the most intimate relationships (vv. 7-12); and (3) to whole cities which might become infected with the crime

(vv. 13-19). The close logical connection, both of the subject and its treatment with what immediately precedes, is the first thing that attracts attention.

The Deuteronomic code, opening with the twelfth chapter, begins with a command addressed to the people to totally destroy idolatry and remove every vestige of it from the land which the Lord their God is giving them as a possession (xii. 2-4). Next follow directions respecting their own place of worship. There is to be but one such place, and the Lord himself will designate it (xii. 5-28). Then comes the present law prohibiting under penalties, the severest known to the Pentateuch, efforts from any quarter to draw away the people into heathenism. In these three phases of the law, together with a later section (xvii. 2-5) on the punishment of Hebrew idolaters, we have what seems intended to be a complete presentation of the subject as well in its positive as its negative side. And it is not easy to see how any code could have more fully met the requirements of the case on the supposition that the Israelitish people are what and where they purport to be. It offers, by far, the most developed form of Pentateuchal legislation on this theme. That of the middle books, notwithstanding the fact that it is supposed to have originated during the Exile, when the popular spirit of opposition to idolatry really culminated, is not only less comprehensive but much less stringent. And what more natural? The gigantic evil against which a struggle, unsuccessful for a full millennium was to be undertaken, now fairly confronted them. Every part of the law breathes the spirit of originality and of initiatory movement. There are two allusions to the exodus from Egypt (vv. 6, 11). The crossing of the Jordan is in immediate prospect; participial forms and the future tense of the verb characterize every reference to the promised land.

On the contrary, there is nothing in the times of King Josiah, eight centuries later, where critics would anchor our code, save his singular zeal for purity of worship, that could suggest the origin of such a statute in his time. He did, it is true, slay on their own altars some priests of the high places of Samaria (II. Kings xxiii. 20); but the history of that period furnishes no occasion for the peculiar specifications of our law touching idolatrous *prophets* (vv. 2-6); and its form, in other respects, especially in its allusions to Canaanitish neighbors, would have been an anachronism at so late a day. It is universally admitted that the reforms of Josiah were largely inspired and directed by this law. But how is it to be accounted for, unless by the account it gives of itself? On no principle of development could it have been

the spontaneous product of the age wherein it wrought so mightily. The reformation in the days of Hezekiah and other earlier kings is also evidence against it. If, however, from the period of the Conquest, it had existed and lain comparatively dormant, but now, when the divided kingdom was hastening to its fall, under the divine Providence it had come to its inherited right and its legitimate influence, the prodigious effects produced may be readily understood. There is many an analogous fact in the history of Christianity. In the vegetable world, too, as is well known, there are plants that reach their bloom only after lengthy periods of seeming unproductiveness. But there is no period when the flower is not present in germ, or that all the energies of the plant are not steadily working towards it.

The next independent law of Deuteronomy relates to the *appointment of judges and officers* (xvi. 18), "Judges and officers shall ye appoint for yourselves in all your gates." By "judges," magistrates seem to be meant, and by "officers," their assistants. In a second passage (xvii. 8-13) it is further enjoined that if these local magistrates find any case brought before them for decision too difficult, they — the judges or elders, not the people — may carry it up to the central place of worship and submit it to the Levitical priests or to the judge, *i.e.*, supreme magistrate who might be ruling in those days; a verdict thus obtained should be irreversible. The law obviously contemplates a settled order of things in the land of Canaan. It does not, however, presuppose it. The cities referred to are those which the Lord their God is *on the point of giving them* (נֹתֵן). It shows, no doubt, an advance as it respects the institutions of the wilderness (Ex. xviii. 13-26; cf. Numb. xi. 16, 17, 24-29), but an advance along the same line. The original provision for seventy elders is so extended as to adapt it to circumstances in immediate prospect. The dignity and the civil power which, up to this time, had inhered in Moses and the high priest are now to be vested in the priests of the central sanctuary and the chief magistrate of the nation.

And this arrangement seems actually to have been carried out, at least in its main features, in the post-Mosaic history, by Joshua (viii. 33, xxiv. 1), during the time of the Judges (cf. Ruth iv. 1-9), and in the life of Samuel. It is maintained, however, that in this whole matter our author simply imputes to Moses something that must have originated at a much later day. Even so conservative a critic as Riehm¹ affirms that the existence in his time of a court of appeal is

¹ *Gesetzgebung Moses*, p. 62; *Wörterbuch*, s.v. "Gerichtswesen."

presupposed by the writer of Deuteronomy. And inasmuch as the history gives us no account of an institution like it before the reign of Jehosaphat (II. Chron. xix. 8-11) five centuries later, we must conclude that the law relating to judges and officers was made after his day. To this reasoning and conclusion alike we are quite unprepared to subscribe. For, in the first place, if anything is taken for granted in the Deuteronomic law of the higher court, it is the possibility, and the custom of appeal, not the existence of this very court. With such a general custom the people had been familiar at least for a generation, the harder questions having all along been carried to Moses and Aaron, and after Aaron's death to Moses and Eleazer (Numb. xxvii. 2). This practice was now to be continued, the highest civil authority acting for the lawgiver. In the second place, the court instituted by Jehosaphat was, in some of its features, a totally different affair from the one before us. It was composed of priests *and* Levites, instead of Levitical priests. It had a civil as well as ecclesiastical head acting at one and the same time. Our law presents them as acting independently. The civil head is represented by a family chief of Judah (נָגִיד), an official unknown to Deuteronomy in this connection, with whom are associated also some of the chiefs of the fathers of Israel; while the high priest is the ecclesiastical head. In the third place, we find David, a hundred and fifty years before the time of Jehosaphat, apparently guided in his appointment of officials by the Deuteronomic code (I. Chron. xxiii. 1-4, xxvi. 29-32). It might, indeed, be objected that this account of what David did is found only in the much depreciated history of the Chronicler. But if the second of his books be competent authority for the alleged acts of Jehosaphat, the first should be thought no less so for those of David.

The law for the *punishment of Hebrew idolaters* (xvii. 2-5) has been already casually mentioned in connection with that concerning *seduction to idolatry*. Like the latter, it professes to be anticipatory legislation (v. 2); and there would be no further need of calling attention to it, were it not for a peculiar species of idolatry to which it refers: "And hath gone and served other gods and worshipped them as the sun or the moon or any of the host of heaven which I have not commanded" (v. 3). The worship of the heavenly bodies, Sabæanism, is here recognized as a possibility. But from the historical books of the Old Testament (II. Kings xxi. 3 ff.; II. Chron. xxxiii. 3 ff.), we learn that the public introduction of such worship in Judah took place in the reign of Manasseh at the beginning of the

seventh century before Christ. It is accordingly held that the present law would be out of place in the time of Moses, the tacit assumption, of course, being that a law never precedes, but always follows, the outbreak of the crime against which it is directed.

But, were such a principle to be admitted in the present case, the conclusion reached would by no means follow, since there is overwhelming evidence that this particular form of idolatry had been known to the Israelites from the beginning. The kingdom of *Israel* had practised it long before the time of Manasseh, as witnessed to by the Books of Kings (II. Kings xvii. 16). Amos, too (v. 26 f.), during the reign of Jeroboam II., makes direct reference, as is now acknowledged by the best authorities, to the worship of Saturn in the northern kingdom, naming the planet both by its Accadian and its Assyrian title.¹

It is indisputable, moreover, that sun, moon, and star worship was one of the most primitive and universal forms of idolatry among the leading nations with which the Hebrews during the Mosaic period came in contact. It lay at the basis of the Baal and Astarte cultus of their Canaanitish neighbors. Its prevalence in Egypt is proved by the monuments.² And how seriously Abraham's Chaldaean ancestry was devoted to it, appears from the fact that in the wedge-shaped inscriptions of their day, the uniform ideographic representation of the divinity was a star.³ Hence, so far from finding it strange that we meet with an alleged Mosaic law of this sort in Deuteronomy, we should think it strange if under the circumstances supposed it were not there.

¹ See Riehm's *Wörterbuch*, s.v. "Assyrien," "Sonne," "Sterne"; also Schrader, *Die Keilinschriften*, etc. 2te Aufl., p. 442, and in *Studien und Kritiken*, 1874, pp. 324-322. Hommel, too (*Die Vorsemitischen Culturen* i. (2), p. 204), speaks of the renowned temple of the goddess of the Moon, which the old king of Ur, Ur-bagas (c. 2870 B.C.), and his son Dungi built; and still further (p. 209), of a temple of the Sun at Larsa, the Ellasar of Gen. xiv. 1. Rawlinson, in *The Religions of the Ancient World* (p. 145), says of the religion of the Phœnicians, "That Shamas or Shemesh, 'the Sun,' was worshipped separately from Baal has been already mentioned. In Assyria and Babylonia he was one of the foremost deities; and his cult among the Phœnicians is witnessed to by such names as Abed-Shemesh, which is found in two of the native inscriptions. . . . The sun-worship of the Phœnicians seems to have been accompanied by a use of sun-images of which we have perhaps a specimen in the accompanying figure which occurs on a votive tablet found in Numidia."

² Cf. Ebers, s.v. "Egypten," in Riehm's *Wörterb.*; also s.v. "Gebet," *idem*.

³ *Idem.*, s.v. "Assyrien." Cf. Rawlinson, *Ancient Mon.*, i., pp. 125, 127.

Besides, the form of the statute is not to be overlooked : "And hath gone and served other gods . . . which I have not commanded." A certain kind of worship then had been enjoined. We cannot well be mistaken in supposing that the second of the ten commandments is specially referred to. "Thou shalt have no other gods before me," and especially the clause, "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image or any likeness of that which is in heaven above" (Ex. xx. 3, 4). And we are confirmed in this view by what is said in a previous chapter of Deuteronomy (iv. 19), where the writer, indirectly commenting on the giving of the law at Horeb, alludes to this very thing, *i.e.*, interprets the second commandment, as it would seem in this sense : "And lest thou lift up thine eyes unto heaven, and when thou seest the sun and the moon and the stars, all the host of heaven, shouldst be led to worship and serve them." So that the force of the concluding words of our law, "worship any of the host of heaven which I have not commanded," may fairly be said to be, "which I have elsewhere already forbidden."

We come next in order to the *law of the king* (Deut. xvii. 14-20). Fault has often been found with the original political constitution of the Hebrew people, as formulated in the Pentateuch, on the ground of its impracticability. It was, to some extent, impracticable and for a very natural reason. A pure theocracy would be wholly practicable only among unfallen or perfectly sanctified men. But it is not to be regarded as a defect of the Mosaic constitution that it put forward so unique and noble an ideal ; that it pursued it till its practicability at that time, and under the circumstances that then prevailed, was fully demonstrated ; or, further, that from the first it foresaw the exigencies that would arise (Gen. xvii. 16, xxxvi. 31, xlix. 10), and made provision for them by means of statutes designed to regulate and limit what might not be wholly prevented. The law of the king, as we find it recorded in Deuteronomy, is, on its face, framed in anticipation of a juncture to arise. It looks forward to a period when the Canaanites shall have been dispossessed, their land apportioned, and Israel definitely settled in it (*cf.* יֵשׁב, יֵרֵשׁ, כָּא). The demand for a king would then arise. It would come from the people. Permission is granted to comply with this demand conditionally, and directions given in detail, concerning the manner of the sovereign's choice, the title he shall bear (מֶלֶךְ not שֵׁלִיט or מוֹשֵׁל), the government of his household, his income, his relative position among his brethren, the succession and other matters, in a way to set him wholly apart from any contemporaneous kings, so, indeed, as to show that he

was to be a king under the peculiar conditions of a government that must still be recognized as, in the end, theocratic. The law, in short, is Mosaic in the finest shading of its phraseology. It is true that some temptations and evil practices of kings in general—in the event proving to be also those of later Israelitish kings, like Solomon—seem to have been directly in mind throughout, and guarded against. But with the knowledge of what the kings of Egypt and Canaan were, what less could have been expected of such a man as Moses, to say nothing of the fact that our book represents him as a prophet.

On the other hand, there are features of this law which plainly preclude the theory of its supposed origin, near the close of the seventh century, B.C. What sense in such a supposition in the injunction that a foreigner was not to be set up as king? Already, for centuries, the succession had been firmly established in the family of David.¹

Or, in forbidding to lead the people back again to Egypt? Such a return had not been thought of since the first crossing of the Jordan; although so familiar a subject in the *mouths of the people* in Moses' time (Ex. xvi. 3; Numb. xi. 5, xiv. 4).

It is true that we do not find Samuel, when long after the subject of a king is broached by the discontented people (I. Sam. viii. 1 ff.), quoting this law. And there is excellent reason for his not doing so. He is looking at the matter and speaking of it from the point of view of his petitioners. He calls attention to the additional and oppressive burdens the new office will entail on them; to the more than questionable spirit and form in which their request is made. It is true that he feels obliged to condemn the project, as it is brought before him, just as Gideon had already done (Judges viii. 22–23); and that, finally, in those particular circumstances—as in any circumstances if the best thing were wanted—the request for a king is conceded under protest. But there is just as little reason on this ground for holding that Samuel was unacquainted with the Deuteronomic law of the king, as there is for holding that Hosea was not acquainted with it, who

¹ Delitzsch (*Zeitschrift für kirchliche Wissenschaft*, etc., 1880, p. 565) has sufficiently answered the point made by Prof. Robertson Smith (*Answer to the Amended Libel*, p. 26), who refers to Is. viii. 5, "wonach die syrisch-ephraimitische Ligue die Davidische Dynastie zu beseitigen und einen Syrer Ben-Tab'el zum Könige von Juda zu machen gedachte, indem er dabei bemerkt, dass eine Partei in Juda dieses Vorhaben begünstigte. Aber woher weiss er dass so gewiss? Es ist nichts als auf streitiger und mehr als unwahrscheinlicher Deutung von Ies. 8, 6 beruhende Vermuthung."

also says (xiii. 11) that God gave to Israel a king in his anger; or that St. Stephen (Acts xiii. 21) was ignorant both of Samuel's and of Hosea's words, because in his reference to the choice of Saul as king he says not a word of there being any opposition to it. The *people* of Samuel's time, it is evident, knew of the law; they do not overlook the advantage they have in it in the appeal they make. They use its language almost word for word in Hebrew, "make us a king to judge us like all the nations" (I. Sam. viii. 5; *cf.* Deut. xvii. 14). And it has been noticed that the whole context is saturated with Deuteronomic expressions and ideas.¹

Not inferior in importance to this law of the king, among the independent statutes of the present code, is that relating to *the prophet*

¹ *Cf.* Sime, *Kingdom of All Israel* (London, 1883), pp. 35-38; and Prof. Green in the *Sunday School Times* for Oct. 6, 13, 1883. The ingenious theory of Ewald adopted by Riehm (*Gesetzgebung Moses*, p. 81 ff.), that in the specification of our law that the king "shall not multiply horses to himself, nor cause the people to return to Egypt, to the end that he may multiply horses," the hiring out of Israelites as mercenaries to the Egyptian king is meant; and that such a state of things might well have existed in the time of Manasseh is utterly lacking in documentary support. The only passage that even looks in this direction is the threatening contained in Deut. xxviii. 68, that in case of unfaithfulness the people shall be carried down to Egypt in ships. Aside from this there is not a hint of such a possibility in the biblical books. And it is impossible to suppose that if a project so repugnant to the Jewish spirit and institutions had been entertained, it would have been so completely overlooked.

Moreover, in the narrative of the crowning of Joash, c. 878 B.C. (II. Kings xi. 12), there is a notable allusion to a law of some kind that was committed to him. It is said of the high-priest on that occasion that he brought forth the king's son, and put the crown and the testimony upon him. On the word **העדות** Thenius says (*Com., in loco*) that it was not an ornament, not a phylactery on the crown, not the royal insignia, but the law, a book in which Mosaic regulations had been written. This conclusion is certainly in harmony with the uniform employment of the word in the Old Testament. And Kleinert (*Deuteronomium*, p. 97), with other first-rate authorities supposes that our Deuteronomic law of the king is specially meant. Whether this be so, or as seems more likely, it be the entire code of Deuteronomy that is referred to (*cf.* Deut. xvii. 18, 19), there can be little doubt that it was considered the proper thing to do to put a written copy of some portion of the Pentateuchal law in the hands of the king on his accession. And since this is one of the very things enjoined in the statute we are now considering, it is to be inferred that the custom arose in this way through the mediation of the priests, in whose hands it was kept.

(xviii. 15-19). "A prophet from the midst of thee, from thy brethren like myself, shall the Lord thy God raise up unto thee," etc. It is most singularly introduced in connection with a prohibition of magic, to which, in fact, it holds a subordinate position. Moses is the speaker. He assumes as something well understood, that this prophet had been already provided for at the giving of the law in Sinai, although we have no other record of such a provision. He declares that when he comes he will be the mouth-piece of Jehovah to Israel, and that whoever refuses to hear him, it will be required of him.

Nowhere is the personality of the great mediator of the Sinaitic covenant more distinctly impressed on an utterance of the Pentateuch. Now, let it be supposed that it was not he. Let us look for a moment at the hypothesis, that it is some unknown prophet or priest of many centuries later who is speaking here, as if he were Moses. What must have been the man's temerity to press his impersonation to the extent that he not only makes the supposititious law-giver say that the coming prophet will be like himself, but refer to an event in his own and their past history, concerning which the Pentateuch is silent, and the people of that later day were probably ignorant? How strange the working of his mind, especially if he were himself a prophet, that he should introduce in so dubious a connection, *i.e.*, as subordinate to a law on magic, the matter of Hebrew prophecy, and the culmination of it too, an institution surpassed by no other in its grandeur and importance.

It is not to be supposed that critics who reject the Mosaic authorship of these laws will, with Delitzsch and others, see in the present one a direct, not to say exclusive, prophetic reference to the Messiah. They would rather choose to hold, it is likely, that if there be a latent allusion to such a possible outcome of prophecy, it is simply the product of a wholly natural hope and aspiration of the Jewish mind. But, if this be so, and we have before us simply an *ex post facto* reference to Hebrew prophets and prophecy in general, as they had come to be, and to be known long before the conjectured date of Deuteronomy, it is certainly a surprising and well-nigh incredible circumstance. The almost surreptitious manner of its introduction, as we have said, puzzles us. It presents, moreover, but a single one of the prophet's many-sided functions. It characterizes men like Samuel, Gad, and Elijah, Obadiah, Amos, and Jonah as being like Moses, which would set everybody to thinking of more respects in which they were quite unlike him. It speaks of a prophet, has the office prin-

cipally in mind, when more than a score and a half of them, differing from one another as widely as Elisha and Jeremiah had already appeared, whose activities had extended over a period of five hundred years. It offers as a criterion to prove the claims of such as might give themselves out for prophets, the fulfilment or non-fulfilment of their predictions; when such seers of the distant future as Isaiah and Micah were then upon the stage, for whom so specific a test would have been as inappropriate as it was fitting for the sporadic prophets and their imitators in the early days.

We meet next, in the series of laws now under review, with one against the *removing of landmarks* (Deut. xix. 14): "Thou shalt not remove the boundary line of thy neighbor which those going before have placed as a boundary in thy inheritance which thou shalt inherit in the land the Lord thy God is giving thee for a possession." The reference, plainly, is to the fraudulent displacement of boundaries separating one's landed property from that of his neighbor. How serious a breach of equity it was regarded may be inferred from the circumstance that it is one of the acts singled out in the 27th chapter of this book for special execration. The important point now to be considered, however, is a supposed anachronism of the writer in representing Moses as saying, **אשר גבלו ראשנים** "which those going before have set as a boundary." It is rendered by some, "which the forefathers," or "thy forefathers set as a boundary," and is accordingly regarded as a clear *lapsus penne* of our *quasi* legislator of the Exodus. But there is not only no necessity for this rendering, there is, as it seems to us, no propriety in it. The word **ראשנים** is found without the article or any pronominal or other limitation. It means simply "predecessors," and might justly be employed in such a connection by one who was legislating not for any particular emergency, but for the whole future of the covenant people. And that it is used in this sense here and not in that of "forefathers" who had already departed, the context is conclusive proof. The "boundaries" spoken of are those of the land which the Lord their God is on the point of giving them (**נותן**). This participle is as characteristic a feature of all references to the land of Canaan in our code as **יבחר** is of the formula by which the central sanctuary is designated. And the criticism that would impute to our law-giver, whoever he may be, the folly of expressing, within the limits of a single verse, ideas so contradictory as that the Israelites had long been settled in Canaan, and that they had not yet entered it, condemns itself.

¹ Note the significant change in phraseology in Prov. xxii. 28. Cf. also Hos. v. 10.

But to possess and occupy Canaan meant a long and bitter conflict. It is natural, therefore, to find no inconsiderable part of our code devoted to military operations and rules of war. How captives are to be treated, cleanliness in camp, what cities are to be spared and what destroyed, the demolition of heathen shrines. These are some of the timely topics treated by our law-giver on the eve of the conquest. Of a like nature is the one we now take up, regarding *preparation for battle* (Deut. xx. 1-9, xxiv. 5). It is most unique in character, and bears in every part the evidence of strict historic truthfulness.

First, there is an appeal for courage in view of superior members and strength. He who had brought them out of Egypt would be with them. Should they see horses and chariots, they were not to be afraid of them. Afraid of horses and chariots! Childish admonition if it be not childlike and genuine! In Hezekiah's and in Josiah's time the land already swarmed with them. Ahab alone was master of a good two thousand chariots of war (*cf.* Is. ii. 7). And next, the very process of entering on a campaign is simply detailed. It is assumed, in harmony with Numbers (i. 3), that the whole male population, over twenty years of age, and capable of bearing arms is at the place of muster. It is assumed, further, in accord with instructions of the same book (xxvi. 2), that full lists of those subject to military duty are in the hands of the Shoterim. It is also assumed that a priest specially designated for the purpose (הכהן), again in dependence on the Book of Numbers (xxxi. 6), where Phinehas acted in this capacity, will be present to hearten and inspire the host with his trumpet and his brave words. It is assumed that the Shoterim, who have the muster-rolls, are empowered, not only to address the assembled levies, retain or dismiss at will such as are found eligible or ineligible for active service (with v. 6, *cf.* Lev. xix. 3 f.), but also to divide and subdivide them into battalions and companies, set them in battle array, and place suitable leaders at their head.¹ The entire arrangement, in short, is peculiarly primitive, and appropriate only to the earliest periods of the commonwealth. After the rise of king, court, and mighty men of war, after Saul's second year, when three thousand chosen men were made the nucleus of a standing army, especially after David's day, when royal body-guards were customary, and foreign mercenaries began to be employed, such an arrangement would have been antiquated and impossible.

¹ שר' is clearly the object, not the subject, of פקדו. It is required both by the context and by the fact that this verb is not used intransitively.

The *treatment of hostile cities that are not of Canaan* is also made the subject of special legislation in our code (xx. 10-14, 19, 20), and the manner of its introduction is full of meaning. The law-giver had just been speaking of Canaanitish cities, which in sharp discrimination he refers to as "the cities of these nations here" (xx. 15), *i.e.*, lying over against their encampment in the fields of Moab. For them there was one law of procedure. It had been indicated in previous deliverances to which he now refers (v. 17), but it is not alone the peculiar introduction of the subject that is significant. The whole outlook of the legislation is equally so. With what propriety, for example, could a writer of King Josiah's time, three hundred years after the division of the kingdom, a hundred after the final captivity of Israel, when many a fortress of Judah was already in possession of Assyrian troops, in the midst of the moral decadence and political disintegration that are reflected in the prophecy of Jeremiah, preface a command to exterminate the Canaanites, with another specifying how foreign cities were to be besieged and their prospective spoils appropriated? Especially on what principles of psychology could it be anticipated that under circumstances like these a romancing legislator of the later day, without a hint of an impending catastrophe to the polity and people to which he himself belonged, would coolly bethink himself of so small a matter as the fruit-bearing trees that might be growing around the beleaguered towns of imaginary foreign foes, and sedulously enjoin that they be spared for food?

In the ceremonial of *purification for murder*, the murderer being unknown, recorded in Deut. xxi. 1-9, we have a remarkable example of the utmost simplicity of form united with a singularly active consciousness of the sacredness of human life, and the solidarity of human responsibility concerning it.¹ Where, but amidst the simplicity of primitive times, should we find the authorities of different cities determining jurisdiction after a method so rudimental as actual measurement? The entire scene, in its homely picturesqueness, makes the impression of the very beginnings of political existence. The gathering by a perennial stream, an appointed substitute for the unknown criminal in leading, the hand-washing in token of non-complicity with the crime, the touching declaration breaking into prayer: "Our hands shed not this blood and our eyes saw not the deed. Forgive, O Jahveh, thy people Israel, whom thou hast redeemed, and lay not innocent blood to the charge of thy people Israel," are all of the same simple character. If,

¹ Cf. Gen. iv. 10, the Jahvist; ix. 6, P.C.

at first, we seem to be witnessing a sacrifice (*cf.* כָּפַר, v. 8), we soon find that this is not the case. The fundamental elements of a sacrifice are wanting. There is no altar. The blood is not shed. The victim's neck is simply broken (*cf.* Ex. xiii. 13). It is an execution. Justice has done its work as far as it is possible to do it under these circumstances. The murdered man has been avenged by the whole community acting as his נֹאֵל. The same form of words, in fact, that in a previous chapter brought to a close the execution of a wilful homicide (xix. 13) also concludes this ceremony.

The next two topics treated in the independent code of Deuteronomy, that of *female captives* (xxi. 10-14) and a *disobedient son* (xxi. 18-21), offer but indefinite indications of their age. Still, the former implies a state of things like that which existed only on the eve of the Conquest, and for a short time after it. The captives referred to cannot be Canaanitish women with whom marriage was forbidden; and the acquisition of foreign territory and spoils, as we have seen, ceased to be a subject of aspiration, and could not have been one of legislation after the reign of David. While the latter harmonizes perfectly with its historic surroundings as well as with the other codes with which it is associated (Ex. xxi. 17; Lev. xx. 9), and seems to be definitely referred to in some passages of the Chokma literature. (Prov. xix. 18, falsely rendered in the A. V.: *cf.* xxx. 17; Ecclus. iii. 1-16.)¹

A peculiar regulation concerning *the bodies of persons who had been hung* is met with in Deut. xxi. 22, 23. It is enjoined that they be buried on the day of execution, in order that they may not pollute the land. While in itself containing nothing out of harmony with a supposed Mosaic date, there is a positive confirmation of such date in the Book of Joshua. In two notable instances this appointed successor of Moses is reported as acting in studied consistency with this law (viii. 29, x. 27). It is true that much of the Book of Joshua is alleged to have been written by the author of Deuteronomy, but these two passages are not included by the majority of critics in that part of it, but admitted to be among its oldest portions.²

A law requiring that in the case of building "a new house," a parapet for safety be made around the roof (xxii. 8), might imply either previous and customary life in tents, or that the new-comers would find

¹ It is an interesting fact, and not without significance, that the old Babylonian family customs were very similar to those here indicated. If a son refused to obey his father *or his mother*, various severe punishments might be visited upon him, even to selling him as slave. *Cf.* Hommel, *ibid.*, p. 416.

² See Kleinert, *ibid.*, p. 96 f.

in Canaan houses already built, as, in fact, is directly stated elsewhere (xix. i). An occasion for the introduction of the subject here may possibly have been the fact that the tribes of Reuben, Gad, and the half-tribe of Manasseh, were then in process of providing homes for their families and shelter for their flocks east of the Jordan (Numb. xxxii. 16) antecedent to the passage of the river.

Among the many provisions of the Deuteronomic code inculcating humanity, or conceived especially in a humane spirit, is that regarding a complaint of unchastity previous to marriage, preferred by a husband against a newly-married wife (xxii. 13-21). One main object of it seems to have been to protect an otherwise helpless woman against the brutality of a selfish and unscrupulous lord to whom she was legally bound. The rigorous punishment inflicted on the plaintiff, if he failed to make out his case, the fine (עֲנִי, cf. Ex. xxi. 22), the beating (cf. Deut. xxv. 1-3), and the denial of the right of future separation on any terms (xxiv. 1-4), brings the statute into line with other enactments of the present code, and bespeaks for it the same origin. An extended law for a somewhat similar case is found in Numbers (v. 11-31); but the legal process is wholly dissimilar, and the complaining husband there goes unpunished. Riehm holds¹ that in the codification of the Deuteronomic law we have evidence that the one found in Numbers was already considered antiquated, and that hence the former belongs to a much later period. But the two cases are different enough in their nature to require different laws. Both of the laws are apparently based on old-time customs. The Deuteronomic seems to be more changed, and, possibly, with special reference to that of Numbers, supplementing it, as it were, with the needed moral background and standard by which a one-sided application might be avoided. Without superseding it for the special case it had in view, it emphasizes in its heavy penalties for the baseless slanders of a husband a principle of equity there unrecognized, but which, expressed or unexpressed, should always be understood to rule in similar circumstances.

Israel was considered as forming a peculiar *congregation* (קָהָל)²

¹ *Gesetzgebung*, etc., p. 67.

² This term is found nowhere else in the Pentateuch except in Numb. xvi. 3, xx. 4, where it is used, in the one instance by the promoters of Korah's rebellion, and in the other by the people who murmur at Moses in the wilderness of Zin. In itself, it is thought to indicate a late origin for a document in which it occurs; and its appearance in Joel is one of the reasons given for assigning that work to the period of the Exile. But there were good reasons for its employment in the

of the Lord, and it is not strange that we find at the beginning of its national life *a law defining and restricting its bounds* (Deut. xxiii. 2-9). With a mixed multitude swarming in its camp, a more opportune moment for such a law than just before the Conquest there could not well have been. The first provision concerns persons unmanned by castration or other mutilation of the reproductive organs. Held in honor by contemporaneous people, they failed to meet the totality of the divine claim; as they were unable also, in some instances, to comply with the requisition of the Abrahamic covenant whose seal was circumcision.

Yet such a law would scarcely have been suggested to the imagination of a man eight centuries later. Even Samuel mentions eunuchs as among the prospective servants of Israelitish kings (I. Sam. viii. 15). And so we find them at the court of Ahab (I. Kings xxii. 9), of Joram (II. Kings viii. 6, ix. 32), and in the kingdom of Judah employed with honor by the very successor of Josiah (II. Kings xxiv. 12, 15). Israelites, it is likely, they were not; but foreign slaves. Still, their employment is no slight symptom of altered circumstances. And we are not surprised to see Isaiah (lvi. 3 ff.)¹ advancing to a far more spiritual view, making, in fact, the transition to that new economy in which the queen of Ethiopia's eunuch becomes a distinguished trophy of this same "ecclesia of the Lord."

But, from a special subordinate class, our law goes on to mention nationalities that are eligible or ineligible to the privilege of Jewish citizenship. And here the impress of its time upon the document becomes still more decided. The attitude assumed by our law-giver towards these nations does not seem unnatural, if he be Moses. But no writer in his senses could have seriously taken it after the time of Solomon. Because of their treatment of Israel on their march from Egypt (Numb. xx. 18 ff., xxii. 5) the Ammonite and Moabite are forever shut out from citizenship among the chosen people. The

middle books of the Pentateuch under the historical circumstances mentioned; and there is no good reason why, later, Moses should not himself have adopted the word and filled it with a better spirit. Moreover, the principle that rules in this whole section is thoroughly Levitical. Its requirements are quite analogous to those respecting the qualifications of a priest (Lev. xxi. 17 ff.), as also of all offerings made to the Lord (xxii. 18 f. 24). And it is not the first time that the Deuteronomic code has shown a marked advance beyond that of the middle books in the sentiment that Israel was to be a consecrated, priestly nation (with Lev. xvii. 15, cf. Deut. xiv. 21).

¹ Schultz (*Com., in loco*) has called attention to the coloring of the language in the context as seeming to show a dependence on Deuteronomy.

Edomite is admitted to it after a short probation ; so, too, the Egyptian, — the former on the ground of kindred blood, the latter on that of hospitality to the Hebrew strangers.

Turn now to the earliest prophets. There is scarcely one of them who is not found facing in a contrary direction. So it is with Hosea (vii. 16, viii. 13), with Joel (iv. 19), with Amos (iii. 9), and especially Isaiah, in the first forty chapters of whose prophecy there are nearly as many denunciations of Egypt. And Edom ! Considering their historical relations to Israel, nothing could be more friendly than the tone in which our law alludes to them. But we find absolutely no echo of it in any subsequent period, even down to the time of the Maccabees (I. Macc. vi. 31). Saul fought with them (I. Sam. xiv. 47) ; David, for a time, made them tributary (II. Sam. viii. 14). Under Joram they regained their independence. They were the heartiest allies of Syria and Ephraim against Ahaz (c. B.C. 740) ; and never did their traditional hatred show itself more conspicuously than in the siege and capture of Jerusalem (B.C. 588), when, in the language of the Psalmist, they cried out, "Raze it, raze it to the foundation thereof !" (Ps. cxxxvii. 7). All the more important prophets from Obadiah and Joel to Ezekiel hold a position towards Edom which is the exact antithesis of that of the Deuteronomic law. Which one of them, or what man of their time could possibly have been the author of it ?¹

We come next to a brief regulation touching runaway slaves of foreign masters seeking refuge in Israel (xxiii. 16, 17). They are not to be given up, but allowed to dwell unmolested wherever they will. The law is stamped with no indubitable marks of Mosaic origin. If fitness of political and moral relationships is to be the criterion, it might be adjusted to almost any age of the world, from B.C. 1800 to the present time. If a theory of interpolations is to be allowed free play, there is many a period of Israelitish history subsequent to Moses when it might have been fitly interjected among the Pentateuchal laws. But why may it not be Mosaic, as it claims ? It breathes his spirit. It is most apposite to the circumstances of Israel, as themselves fugi-

¹ We find a similar, if a less marked, change of feeling with respect to Moab indicated in the later times. The story of Ruth, the Moabitess, was probably written not long after the death of David. The scenes it described occurred a full hundred years earlier (Ruth i. 1). And, although the history represents this people as more or less inimical to Israel or Judah down to the latest periods, still the spirit of the Book of Ruth is clearly reflected in the great prophet of King Josiah's day, who, after predicting their overthrow, declares : "Yet will I bring again the captivity of Moab in the latter days, saith the Lord" (xlviii. 47, cf. xlix. 6, 7, 18).

tives from Egypt. It harmonizes well, too, with the oft-repeated reference to the former thralldom. And, happily, the monuments furnish us with positive evidence that such a law would at least be no anachronism at the time of the Exodus. In an extant treaty between Rameses II. and the king of the Hittites, one article relates to this very matter of the mutual exchange of fugitive servants. That Moses was acquainted with this fact, and intentionally forbade what it as positively required, we need not assert. Enough that in this case the science of archæology comes promptly forward to set a bound to the literary fancies that are so inclined to run riot among these ancient records.¹

Of peculiar historic as well as moral interest is the Deuteronomic *law of divorce* (xxiv. 1-4). The form in which it is found, the character of much of the legislation with which it is associated, as well as the very nature of the case, serve of themselves greatly to weaken the force of the objection that it is too developed a law for the period of the Exodus. Were no weight to be allowed to the statement in Genesis (ii. 21-24) for the genuineness of which our Lord seems to vouch (Matt. xix. 4, 5, 8), that monogamy was the original and designed relationship of husband and wife, it might be expected that the relation of the sexes would be one of the first and principal respects in which a perverted nature would manifest itself. And we find accordingly that cognizance is taken of it in what purports to be the earliest history and the earliest laws (*cf.* history of Abraham and the seventh commandment). And the regulation now before us might be regarded as little more than a specification under the seventh commandment. It is remarkable alike for its concessive and its restrictive character. It assumes the prevalence of divorce, — a fact also recognized in a number of other laws of this and the Levitical code (Lev. xxi. 7; Deut. xxii. 19, 29). It assumes that it was carried on with some degree of formality. And such a custom, with the form it took of giving a "bill of divorcement," our law does not forbid; neither does it command it. Herein our Lord corrected the Pharisees' false quotation of the Pentateuch, changing their "Why did Moses command" into "Moses suffered."

In its restrictions, on the other hand, the law assumes the sacredness of the marital tie, and provides against an obvious tendency to break and renew it at will. Its sole prohibition, however, is of the re-marriage of divorced persons after a second marriage had been en-

¹ See *Records of the Past*, iv., p. 31 f.

tered upon by the former wife. This, as the words "after that she has been defiled" (*cf.* Numb. v. 20) indicate, it looked upon as a form of adultery and not to be tolerated. The law tends directly to the preservation of the original tie; and, in case it is severed, plainly encourages a single life in view of a possible later reunion. It does not rise to the plane of Malachi (ii. 13-16), who declares that God "hates putting away." But neither, on the other hand, does it misrepresent a Moses of the exodus, or go beyond what might have been expected of a legislation that followed and flowed out of the ten commandments.¹

Punishment by flogging (Deut. xxv. 1-3) seems to have been resorted to in Israel chiefly for gross offences against sexual morality (Lev. xix. 20; Deut. xxii. 18). The spirit of the Deuteronomic law respecting it is thoroughly national in its recognition of the Israelitic election and brotherhood. At the same time the mode of inflicting the punishment by making the offender lie flat upon his face is thoroughly Egyptian, and positively out of harmony with the later rabbinical practice.²

Levirate marriage, legally sanctioned first in Deuteronomy (xxv. 5-10), had no doubt prevailed in its main features from the earliest times. In the narrative of Judah's sin with his daughter-in-law (Gen. xxxviii.), assigned by critics to the document JE., we find the practice already in force to the extent that any breach of it is regarded as a serious crime. Accordingly, the Levitical regulation (Lev. xviii. 16), forbidding marriage with a deceased brother's widow, is obviously to be limited to cases where there were children, as also the Jews of our Lord's time understood it.³ And not only is our law in its place in the age of Moses with respect to that which goes before it, but also that which follows. The story of Ruth, whose scene is laid in the period of the Judges, is evidently not a little modified by it. The detailed proceedings of Boaz, his singular care to follow a certain fixed order, his appeal to the regular legal tribunal of his city, and the motive he urges for his conduct, in which he uses almost the very language of our code, to "raise up the name of the dead upon his in-

¹ The last remark is fully supported by what is known from the monuments of ancient Babylonian customs. If a man would separate from his wife, who had not been untrue to him, he was obliged to pay her a sum of money so large that very few could have availed themselves of the legal right. *Cf.* Hommel, *ibid.*, p. 417.

² See *The Criminal Code of the Jews according to the Talmud Massechath Synhedrin*, by Berger. Lond., 1880, p. 122 f.

³ *Versus* Riehm, *Gesetzgebung*, etc., p. 68.

heritance," give at least a color of probability to the theory that the law of Deuteronomy was already a recognized authority in Palestine.

The next independent ordinance of our code *prescribing punishment for a gross act of immodesty* on the part of a woman (xxv. 11, 12) offers no internal characteristics by which its age might be even approximately fixed, unless it be the form of the punishment. The offending hand was to be cut off. It is the only instance in the Pentateuch where mutilation is directly enjoined. So unusual and severe a retribution for such an act would scarcely have been thought of in the later time.

The *commission for the destruction of Amalek*, found in Deuteronomy (xxv. 17-19), there can be little doubt, refers directly to Ex. xvii. as its basis and original. An entire clause of the Hebrew, and the most essential one, is repeated word for word. The appeal, moreover, is made in a way to indicate an event still fresh in remembrance: "Remember ¹ that which Amalek did to thee in the way as ye came out of Egypt." And still another side-light appears in an allusion to the present circumstances of Israel: "So it shall come to pass that when the Lord thy God hath given thee rest from all thine enemies round about, in the land which the Lord thy God is giving thee to possess as an inheritance, thou shalt wipe out the remembrance of Amalek from under heaven; forget it not."

If now, on the other hand, we follow the biblical history of the relations of Israel to Amalek, subsequent to this supposed period of the Exodus, we shall see how impossible and absurd it would have been for such directions to be seriously promulgated as late as the reign of Josiah or even that of Solomon. After their first defeat in a sharply-contested battle with Joshua at Rephidim (Ex. xvii. 8-16), we find them joining the Canaanites in a successful attack on Israel at Hormah (Numb. xiv. 43-45). Later Balaam, in his prophecy, for some reason not clearly known, hails them as the "first of the nations," but predicts their total overthrow (Numb. xxiv. 20). Another hundred years follow, and, as allies of the Ammonites and Moabites, they make a partially successful foray upon the coasts of Israel (Judges iii. 13). Then Gideon successfully warred with them. But it was not till the days of Israel's first king that the Pentateuchal commission really began to be executed. In two great campaigns Saul broke their strength, wasted their land, and put to death their king (I. Sam. xiv. 48, xv. 2-33). The entire history of this war is pervaded by the

¹ The infin. abs., like the emphatic imperative in Greek, Gesen. § 131, 4, b., is used.

spirit of the ancient code. Samuel's words to the king are: "Thus saith Jehovah of hosts, 'I am punishing (visiting judicially, פָּקַדְתִּי) that which Amalek did to Israel. . . . Now go and cut off Amalek and utterly destroy all, that he has'" (Sam. xv. 2, 3). And thoroughly as Saul did his work, it did not satisfy the terms of his commission. David dealt the hostile remnant a heavy blow after their capture of Ziklag, and in Hezekiah's time, still a century before the date assigned by some to the Deuteronomic code, so reduced and feeble had they become that five hundred Simeonites are able to complete their overthrow and extinction (I. Chron. iv. 43). After this time the name of Amalek disappears from history.

Our code is brought to a fitting close by a peculiar formula of acknowledgment and thanksgiving. It is professedly given to be used immediately subsequent to the conquest and quiet occupation of the promised land. Critics are not satisfied with this account which the document gives of itself, and see in its strong liturgical cast positive marks of a later day. Kleinert, however, among others, takes exception to this opinion as being unworthy of an age in which the knowledge of the Vedas has ceased to be a monopoly.¹ It may be added that such an objection is unworthy of an age that has brought to light the stores of information contained on Egyptian and Assyrian monuments. This one simple liturgical ceremonial of Deuteronomy we are able, in fact, to match with many far more elaborate ones, in different tongues, that date from even an earlier period.² The wonder is, indeed, not that we have this one simple, prescribed formula of thanksgiving for the individual Israelite in his periodical visits to the central sanctuary, but that, in all the biblical literature before the Exile, it stands so much alone. We have really nothing of a precisely similar character with which to compare it. And in view of the consideration that prayer, in some form, must date

¹ *Das Deuteronomium*, p. 104.

² See especially an inscription from the tomb of Beni-Hassan, of the 12th Egyptian dynasty, in Warrington's *When was the Pentateuch Written*, p. 18 f.; also, the prayer of Menkaura to Osiris, dating as far back as the 5th dynasty (Wilson's *The Egypt of the Past*, London, 1881, p. 93), and the philosophical precepts of Ptah-hotep (*ibid.*, p. 107 f.), computed to be five thousand years old; and cf. Rawlinson, *The Religions of the Ancient World*, p. 60 f., and 24, where he says of the religion of ancient Egypt that its "worship was conducted chiefly by means of rhythmic litanies or hymns, in which prayer and praise were blended, the latter predominating." For still other specimens of this liturgical worship see *Records of the Past*, vol. ii., pp. 105, 134; vol. iv., pp. 99-104; vol. vi., pp. 99-101; vol. viii., pp. 131-134.

back to the beginnings of human history, it would seem the height of captiousness to characterize the ceremonial before us as an anachronism in the age of Moses.¹

Such, now, are the independent laws of Deuteronomy, the primary and essential elements, as we may suppose, of this remarkable code. And such are a few of the more patent internal characteristics by which its age as a whole, and in its several parts, might be approximately inferred. That they are demonstrative need not be held; that, however, they show an overwhelming weight of probability in favor of Mosaic origin throughout cannot well be denied. Such an origin, in fact, is directly or implicitly claimed by the great majority of the statutes brought under review, and especially by those that are of chief importance. If it be denied in the case of the rest, is it too much to demand that adequate reasons be given for wrenching them from the ancient mould in which we find them imbedded?²

Mosaic claims, we are well aware, are often summarily dealt with in these days; but sometimes, perhaps, without sufficiently pondering the consequences. The alternative here, at least, does not lack in startling effects. If not Moses, then some one who would be thought to be Moses, or to write in the spirit of Moses. In either case, an antique flavor, Mosaic sanction is wanted. But why? If the critical theories prevailing in many quarters be adopted, there was no Moses who was worthy of such pains. And why, especially, such an excess of Mosaic coloring in a purely legal document, so that it might almost be thought that the laws were a conceit to magnify the half-mythical hero, instead of the name of Moses being used to give weight to the laws.

If not Moses, we ask again, then who? Some king of Judah or

¹ The fact that the firstfruits are to be brought in the hands in a basket, forestalls any objection that might arise on the ground that we have here prescribed a different disposition of the firstfruits from that enjoined in another place (xviii. 4; cf. Numb. xviii. 12 f.).

² So, too, Bleek, in a similar connection (*Einleitung in das Alte Testament*. Vierte Auflage, bearbeitet von J. Wellhausen, Berlin, 1878, p. 35): "Wir sehen also, wie ein bedeutender Theil der Gesetze und Anordnungen des Pentateuchs, sowohl dem Inhalte als der Form nach, dem Mosaischen Zeitalter angehören muss. Da wir nun als ein feststehendes sicheres Ergebniss gefunden haben, dass so bedeutende Theile des Gesetzbuches von Moses herrühren, dass also auf jeden Fall das Wesentlichste der darin enthaltenen Gesetzgebung ihm angehört, so sind wir nicht berechtigt, ihm einzelne der sich darin findenden und auf ihn zurückgeführten gesetzlichen Anordnungen abzusprechen, wenn sie nicht bestimmte Spuren eines abweichenden Characters und einer späteren Zeit an sich tragen."

Israel? The history furnishes no example of a royal legislator; enough, of those who broke and trampled upon the laws of their fathers. Possibly, some prophet then? Which prophet? His modesty in concealing his name and adopting as pseudonym that of the leader of the Exodus is only equalled by the way in which he introduces the subject of prophecy in his work, as incidental to a law regulating magical arts. But why not a priest, possibly Hilkiah himself, who first introduces our code to the attention of his king? Critics are by no means agreed among themselves whether the code is of priestly or prophetic origin; it is too little pronounced in either direction. Priestly, in any decisive features, it is far enough from being; quite the reverse, if its uniform point of view be taken account of. The point of view from beginning to end is conspicuously that of a tender father of his people, emphatically Mosaic, in short, and nothing else. And that it is genuine, and not assumed for effect, the latest results of biblical archeology unite with the best results of literary criticism in strongly confirming.¹

¹ The reasoning employed in this paper, to show that the independent legislation of Deuteronomy is Mosaic, bears with equal force against the theory that it has undergone any special revision, in a period subsequent to Moses. There is neither in form, spirit, or language, any valid evidence whatever of any such revision in the series of laws we have passed under review.

Recent Discussions of Romans ix. 5.

 BY PROF. EZRA ABBOT, D.D., LL.D.

SINCE the publication of the articles on Rom. ix. 5, in the *Journal* of our Society for 1881, there have been several discussions of the passage which seem worthy of notice, especially as in some of them those articles have been quoted with approval or criticised. The venerable pastor and Professor of Theology in the University of Geneva, Hugues Oltramare, has a long and able note upon it in his recent elaborate and valuable *Commentaire sur l'Épître aux Romains* (2 vols., Geneva and Paris, 1881-82). He adopts the doxological construction, placing a period after *σάρκα*. In England, the marginal note of the Revisers appears to have given great offence in certain quarters. "I must press upon every reader," says Canon Cook, "the duty—I use the word 'duty' emphatically—of reading the admirable note of Dr. Gifford [on this passage] in the 'Speaker's Commentary.' I should scarcely have thought it credible, in face of the unanswered and unanswerable arguments there urged, that English divines would venture to have given their sanction to one of the most pernicious and indefensible innovations of rationalistic criticism." (*The Revised Version of the first three Gospels*, Lond., 1882, p. 167, note.) Elsewhere he speaks of "the very painful and offensive note on Romans ix. 5, in the margin of the Revised Version" (*ibid.*, p. 194).

It appears that Canon Cook sent a challenge to Canon Kennedy, Regius Professor of Greek in the University of Cambridge, to meet the arguments of Dr. Gifford, and that this led to the publication of the first pamphlet to be noticed, the title of which is given below.¹ Dr. Gifford replied to Professor Kennedy in a pamphlet of 66 pages,²

¹ *The Divinity of Christ*. A Sermon preached on Christmas Day, 1882, before the University of Cambridge. With an Appendix on Rom. ix. 5, and Titus ii. 13. By Benjamin Hall Kennedy, D.D. . . . Printed by desire of the Vice-Chancellor. Cambridge, also London, 1883. 8°. pp. vii. 32.

² . . . A Letter to the Rev. Benjamin Hall Kennedy, D.D., . . . in reply to Criticisms on the Interpretation of Rom. ix. 5, in "The Speaker's Commentary." By Edwin Hamilton Gifford, D.D. . . . Cambridge, also London, 1883. 8°. pp. 66.

and Professor Kennedy rejoined in a pamphlet of 72 pages, entitled *Pauline Christology*, Part I.¹ We shall probably have in due time a surrejoinder by Dr. Gifford, and Part II. of Professor Kennedy's *Pauline Christology*.

Professor Kennedy translates the last part of Rom. ix. 5 as follows : "And of whom *is* the Christ as concerning flesh. He who is over all *is* God, worthy to be praised for ever. Amen." (*Sermon*, etc., p. 19.) As was remarked in our *Journal* for 1881, pp. 99, 132, there is no grammatical difficulty in this construction. But I cannot adopt the view which Professor Kennedy takes of the passage. He regards the last part of Rom. ix. 5 as added by St. Paul "to win the ear and gain the confidence of the Jews by declaring his adherence to doctrines which they prized, a Jewish Messiah, and one supreme God worthy to be praised for ever." (*Sermon*, p. 21 ; comp. pp. 20, 25, and *Pauline Christology*, I., p. 61.)

My objections to this view are, (1) that there was no need of Paul's declaring his adherence to doctrines which neither he nor any other Christian of that day was ever charged with questioning, the Jewish origin of the Messiah, and the unity of God ; and (2) that the last clause of verse 5, according to Dr. Kennedy's construction, is not a direct affirmation of monotheism in distinction from polytheism, though monotheism is implied in the language.

Were Professor Kennedy's construction of the passage to be adopted, I should rather regard the $\delta \ \acute{\omega}\nu \ \epsilon\pi\iota \ \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omega\upsilon$ as having reference to God's providential government of the universe, and especially to his providential dealings with the Jews, in the revelations and privileges granted them with a view to the grand consummation of them all in the advent of the Messiah, as the head of a new, spiritual dispensation, embracing all men upon equal terms. The $\acute{\omega}\nu$, in this connection, may include the past, present, and future ; and we might paraphrase as follows, supplying what may naturally be supposed to have been in the mind of the Apostle : "He who is over all," He who has presided over the whole history of the Jewish nation, and bestowed upon it its glorious privileges ; He whose hand is in all that is now taking place, who brings good out of evil, the conversion of the Gentiles out of the temporary blindness and disobedience of the Jews ; He whose promises will not fail, who has not cast off his people, and who will

¹ *Pauline Christology*, Part I. Examination of Romans ix. 5, being a Rejoinder to the Rev. Dr. Gifford's Reply. By Benjamin Hall Kennedy, D.D. Cambridge, etc., 1883. 8°. pp. 72.

finally make all things redound to the glory of his wisdom and goodness, "is God, blessed for ever. Amen."

But with this understanding of the bearing of the $\delta \ \delta \nu \ \epsilon \pi \iota \ \pi \acute{\alpha} \nu \tau \omega \nu$, it seems more natural to regard the enumeration of the distinctive privileges of the Jews as ending with $\epsilon \xi \ \delta \nu \ \delta \ \chi \rho \iota \sigma \tau \acute{\omicron} \varsigma \ \tau \acute{\omicron} \ \kappa \alpha \tau \grave{\alpha} \ \sigma \acute{\alpha} \rho \kappa \alpha$, and to take the last clause as a doxology, prompted by the same view of the all-comprehending, beneficent providence of God, and the same devout and grateful feeling, which inspired the doxology at the end of the eleventh chapter.

Professor Kennedy is a devout believer in the doctrine of the Trinity and the deity of Christ; and one cannot help admiring the conscientiousness and sturdy honesty which lead him, in the pure love of truth, to defend an unpopular view of this mooted passage. He speaks feelingly of "that mischievous terrorism, which, like carbonic dioxide in a crowded and closed room, pervades and corrupts with its stifling influence our British theological atmosphere." "Men," he says, "who judge of this verse as I do, and who publish and defend that judgment as I do, know that they have to encounter the open rage of a few, the suppressed displeasure of a great many, and the silence of masses, who, whatever they may think on one side or the other, yet for various private reasons consider 'golden silence' the safe course." (*Pauline Christology*, I., p. 3; comp. pp. 34, 38.)

It is not my purpose to enter into any detailed analysis or criticism of Professor Kennedy's pamphlets. He urges powerfully against Dr. Gifford's view the Pauline usage of $\theta \epsilon \acute{\omicron} \varsigma$, and other considerations; but on some minor points takes positions which seem to me untenable, and exposes himself to the keen criticism of his antagonist, who is not slow to take advantage of any incautious expression. In the *Pauline Christology*, I., pp. 22, 23, he presents, though with some hesitation, an extraordinary view of the cause of Paul's grief expressed in Rom. ix. 2, 3, but I will not stop to discuss it. He also takes an indefensible position (*ibid.*, pp. 26, 32) in regard to Cyril of Alexandria; and draws, I conceive, an inference altogether false (pp. 28, 29) from the passages in Origen against Celsus viii. 12 and 72. The former of these will be discussed hereafter in reply to Dr. Gifford; in the latter we have the expression $\tau \omicron \upsilon \ \epsilon \pi \iota \ \pi \acute{\alpha} \sigma \iota \ \lambda \acute{\omicron} \gamma \omicron \upsilon \ \kappa \alpha \iota \ \theta \epsilon \omicron \upsilon$, where the $\epsilon \pi \iota \ \pi \acute{\alpha} \sigma \iota$ belongs only to $\lambda \acute{\omicron} \gamma \omicron \upsilon$, not to $\theta \epsilon \omicron \upsilon$ also, as Professor Kennedy seems to understand it; comp. *Cont. Cels.* v. 4, $\tau \omicron \upsilon \ . . . \ \epsilon \mu \psi \acute{\upsilon} \chi \omicron \upsilon \ \lambda \acute{\omicron} \gamma \omicron \upsilon \ \kappa \alpha \iota \ \theta \epsilon \omicron \upsilon$. Christ, according to Origen, is $\delta \ \epsilon \pi \iota \ \pi \acute{\alpha} \sigma \iota \ \kappa \acute{\upsilon} \rho \iota \omicron \varsigma$, and $\delta \ \epsilon \pi \iota \ \pi \acute{\alpha} \sigma \iota \ \lambda \acute{\omicron} \gamma \omicron \varsigma$, but not $\delta \ \epsilon \pi \iota \ \pi \acute{\alpha} \sigma \iota \ \theta \epsilon \acute{\omicron} \varsigma$, which is, as Dr. Kennedy elsewhere observes, "the Father's express title, applied by

Origen to the supreme God nearly 100 times." (*Pauline Christology*, I., p. 27.)

Professor Oltramare had not seen the articles in our *Journal*, but replies effectively on many points to the arguments of Godet and Dr. Gifford. I only note here that Oltramare, Dr. Gifford, and Professor Kennedy agree in taking $\delta \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$, in v. 5, not as a proper name, "Christ," but in the sense of "the Christ," "the Messiah," which the definite article suggests and the context requires, or at least favors.

Dr. Gifford's pamphlet is mainly occupied with a reply to Dr. Kennedy, but he bestows some criticisms on my paper in the *Journal* for 1881, of which it seems to me well to take notice. I regret to say that he also makes some complaints, which I must also consider.

He complains, first (*Letter*, p. 27), that in quoting a sentence of his (*Journal*, p. 91), I have omitted altogether the first part, in which the cause of Paul's anguish is said to be "the fall of his brethren."

I omitted it simply for the sake of brevity. I had already assumed this as the cause of his grief at the beginning of the discussion (*Journal*, p. 91). I had expressly mentioned it as such, twice, on the very page (p. 91) containing my quotation from Dr. Gifford; it was implied in the clause "whom they have rejected," which I did quote, and it was a point about which there was no dispute. Every reader would take it for granted that when Paul's anguish was spoken of, it was his anguish on that account. Under these circumstances I fail to perceive how my omission of a part of Dr. Gifford's sentence, in which I had nothing to criticise, has given him any reasonable ground of complaint.

Here I observe that Dr. Gifford passes over without notice the first point of my criticism of his sentence (*Journal*, pp. 91, 92). I still venture to think that it is not unworthy of attention.

Dr. Gifford next complains that after having once quoted the remainder of his sentence fully, I proceed to criticise it, omitting in my second quotation the words "whom they had rejected." I omitted this clause, because, having been just quoted, it seemed unnecessary to repeat it; because it formed no part of the particular *privilege* of the Jews of which Dr. Gifford was speaking, the climax of which was expressed by the words "the *Divine* Saviour"; and because its omission was likely to make the point of my criticism strike the reader somewhat more forcibly. That I have done Dr. Gifford no injustice seems to me clear from the fact that, in the sentence quoted, "his anguish was deepened [not caused] most of all by the fact that their race gave birth to the Divine Saviour," the phrase "his anguish" *can* only mean

"his anguish on account of the rejection of the Messiah by the great majority of his countrymen." This is also clearly implied in the first words of my criticism, "Paul's grief for his unbelieving countrymen, then." Not a word of my criticism, which Dr. Gifford seems to misunderstand, would be affected in the least by the insertion of the omitted clause.

Two typographical errors in Dr. Gifford's pamphlet give a false color to his complaint. He calls on the reader to "observe the note of admiration in place of the all-important words 'whom they had rejected.'" It stands *inside* of the quotation-marks in the sentence as he gives it, as if I had ascribed it to *him*, but *outside* in the sentence as printed in the *Journal*. Again, in quoting his own sentence from the Commentary on Romans, he omits the comma before "whom they have rejected," thus making the relative clause an inseparable part of the sentence, and aggravating my supposed offence in omitting it.

In commenting on Dr. Gifford's assertion that "Paul's anguish was deepened most of all by the thought that their race gave birth to the Divine Saviour, whom they have rejected," I had exclaimed, "Paul's grief for his unbelieving countrymen, then, had extinguished his gratitude for the inestimable blessings which he personally owed to Christ; it had extinguished his gratitude for the fact that the God who rules over all had sent his Son to be the Saviour of the world!" (*Journal*, p. 92.)

Dr. Gifford remarks, "Another note of admiration at Paul's ingratitude, a pure invention of Professor Abbot." (*Letter*, p. 28.)

My critic appears to misunderstand me. I shall be very sorry if, through my unskilful use of irony of which Dr. Gifford speaks, any other reader has failed to perceive that my note of admiration is an expression of wonder that in his reference to the Jewish birth of the Messiah as deepening Paul's grief at the unbelief of his countrymen, and in his whole argument against a doxology, Dr. Gifford ignores the fact that THE ADVENT OF CHRIST, necessarily suggested by the words *καὶ ἐξ ὧν ὁ χριστὸς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα*, was to the Apostle a cause of joy and gratitude immensely out-weighing all temporary occasions of grief, and might well prompt an outburst of thanksgiving and praise to God. That the very language he uses did not suggest this is a marvel. He does not meet at all the point of my objection to his view.

It will be observed that I do not, with many commentators, regard the doxology here as simply or mainly an expression of gratitude for the distinctive privileges bestowed upon the Jews as a nation, and still

less for the particular fact that, as Dr. Gifford expresses it (p. 30, and note in his Commentary), "Christ was born a Jew." That gratitude, not sorrow, was the predominant sentiment in the mind of the Apostle in view of these privileges I do not doubt; but these particular occasions for thankfulness were lost, I conceive, in the thought of the actual advent of Christ, incomparably the greatest and most joyful event in the history of the world, and the most glorious expression of God's love and mercy to man, for which eternal gratitude was due. It was this which prompted the song of the angels, "Glory to God in the highest," and which prompted here the doxology which so fitly closes the Apostle's grand historic survey of those privileges of his people, which were the providential preparation for it.

Let us now consider more particularly Dr. Gifford's arguments and criticisms.

*Jewish Privileges, and Connection of Thoughts in
Rom. ix. 1-5.*

Dr. Gifford assumes that the Apostle, in his enumeration of the privileges which God had bestowed on his nation, names them only as reasons for the deepening of his grief for the fall of his countrymen; and thus finds in vv. 1-5 of the chapter one unbroken strain of lamentation, leaving no room for a doxology.

It appears to me that this is a very narrow view of what was probably in the Apostle's mind, and that there are other aspects of these privileges, which the way in which they are mentioned would more naturally suggest to the reader, and under which it is far more probable that the Apostle viewed them here. As I have elsewhere observed, the *manner* in which he recites them is not that of one touching upon a subject on which it is painful to dwell. To say nothing here of the *οἱ τῶν*, observe the effect of the repetition of the *ὅτι* and the *καί*. Let us consider some of these other aspects.

(1) The privileges of the Jews which the Apostle recounts were the glory of their nation, distinguishing it above all the other nations of the earth. This detailed enumeration of them, so evidently appreciative, was adapted to gratify and conciliate his Jewish readers, and to assure them of the sincerity of his affection for his countrymen. It was also adapted to take down the conceit of his Gentile readers, who were prone to despise the Hebrew race.

(2) These privileges had been the source of inestimable blessings to the Israelites in the course of their long history. (See Rom. iii. 1, 2.) Through them the worship of one God, who rewarded righteousness and punished iniquity, was preserved in their nation.

(3) They were parts of a great providential plan which was to find and had found its consummation in the advent of the Messiah, "the unspeakable gift" of God's love and mercy.

(4) They were tokens of the Divine favor to the Jews as a nation, and especially to their pious ancestors, which gave assurance to Paul that God would not cast off his people, whom he had chosen; that they were still "beloved for the fathers' sake"; that the present unhappy state of things was only temporary, and that, finally, all Israel should be saved.

The first three aspects of these privileges are obvious, and would naturally suggest themselves to every reader of the Epistle; the fourth we have strong reasons for believing to have been also in the mind of the Apostle. (See the eleventh chapter.)

Here I must express my surprise at the manner in which Dr. Gifford has treated my quotations from the eleventh chapter in reference to this last-mentioned aspect of the Jewish privileges. (*Letter*, p. 26 f.) He omits entirely my statement of the purpose for which I introduce them (*Journal*, p. 92), though this is absolutely essential to the understanding of what is meant by "this view" in the first sentence which he quotes from me; and then, wholly without ground, represents me as teaching two things: (1) "that as we read the simple enumeration of Jewish privileges in vv. 3, 4 [he means vv. 4, 5], we are not to connect it, as is most natural, with the preceding context." How can he say this, when in the whole treatment of the subject (*Journal*, pp. 88 f., 91, 2d paragr., 104, 105), I have taken particular pains to point out the connection of thought, and to show that my view of vv. 4, 5 agrees with the context? (2) That "in order to understand the Apostle's meaning at this point, we must anticipate by an effort of our own imagination all the long-sustained argument . . . and the far-reaching prophetic hopes which make up the three following chapters." If Dr. Gifford had not omitted the sentences in which I stated my purpose, it would be at once seen that I did not make these quotations to show what the *reader* of verses 4, 5 is expected to draw from them by an effort of his own imagination, but what the *Apostle*, together with other things more obvious to the reader, may be reasonably supposed to have had in mind when he wrote. When a person treats at length of a subject on which he must have meditated often and long, meeting objections which he must have been frequently called upon to answer, I have been accustomed to suppose that what he actually says may afford some indication of what was in his mind when he began to write.

I admit that the privileges which the Jews enjoyed as a nation may be regarded as having incidentally aggravated the sin and the shame of their rejection of the Messiah; that the contemplation of them under that aspect would have deepened in some measure the Apostle's grief; and that it is possible, though I see nothing which directly proves it, that he viewed them under this aspect here. Dr. Gifford's error, I conceive, lies in ignoring the other obvious aspects, under which they could be only regarded as occasions of thankfulness; and in not recognizing the well-known psychological fact that the same object of thought often excites in the mind at the same time, or in the most rapid succession, mingled emotions of grief and joy and gratitude. One knows little of the deeper experiences of life who has not felt this. That this should be true here in the case of the Apostle who describes himself as "sorrowful, yet always rejoicing"; who exhorts his Christian brethren to "rejoice evermore," and to "give thanks always for all things to God, the Father, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ," cannot be regarded as strange or unnatural.

There is no incongruity between sorrow for the misuse of a great privilege, whether by ourselves or by others, and devout thankfulness to God for its bestowal. In a pious mind, these feelings would naturally co-exist. Take, for example, the privilege of having been born and educated in a Christian land, so sadly abused by the majority of those who enjoy it.

I may note here another fallacy which appears to me to lurk in the language Dr. Gifford uses respecting the Jewish privileges. He repeatedly speaks of them as "lost" (pp. 30, 34, 35), inferring that the remembrance of them can only deepen the Apostle's grief. But these privileges were distinctions and glories of the Jewish people, which from their very nature could not be lost. They, and the blessings of which they had been the source, were facts of history. Even in the case of the unbelieving Jews, though abused, or not taken advantage of, they were not, properly speaking, "lost." The privileges themselves remained unchanged, a permanent subject of thankfulness to God. In Dr. Gifford's assumption that verses 4 and 5 are only a wail of lamentation, he ignores these obvious considerations.

I will here state briefly my view of the connection of thought between vv. 4, 5 of the ninth chapter, and what precedes.

In vv. 1-5 the purpose of the Apostle was to conciliate his Jewish-Christian readers, and indirectly, the unbelieving Jews,¹ by assuring

¹ Though the Epistle to the Romans was not addressed to unbelieving Jews,

them of his strong affection for his people, and his appreciation of their privileges.¹ His affection is shown (1) by his deep sorrow for the unhappy condition of the great mass of his countrymen in their rejection of the Messiah (ver. 2) ; and (2) by his readiness to make any sacrifice, even that of his own salvation, were such a thing possible, if thereby he might bring them to Christ. His appreciation of their privileges is indicated by the detailed manner in which they are enumerated, and is distinctly expressed by the οἷτινές εἰσιν Ἰσραηλεῖται and what follows. The οἷτινές shows that it is not merely because he belongs to the same nation with the Jews that he is ready to make such a sacrifice for them ; but because their nation is *such* a nation, distinguished above all the other nations of the earth ; a nation dedicated to God, whose whole history had been glorified by extraordinary marks of the Divine favor, a nation to which he is proud and thankful to belong. The οἷτινές introduces the *distinguishing characteristic* of his συγγενεῖς κατὰ σάρκα. They are not merely fellow-countrymen, they are ISRAELITES ; and as Philippi remarks, "In dem Namen Israelit lag die ganze Würde des Volkes beschlossen." So far as the word οἷτινές indicates a *causal* relation, it strengthens the reason for the affirmation which *immediately precedes* (not directly that in ver. 2, to which Dr. Gifford refers it) ; it serves, as Tholuck remarks, "zur Begründung eines solchen Grades aufopfernder Liebe." Dr. Gifford's assumption that the memory of these privileges only deepened the Apostle's grief is not proved by the οἷτινές, and really rests on no evidence.

So much for the connection of vv. 4, 5 with what precedes ; how naturally the doxology at the end was suggested, and the reason for

one object of it was to meet, and to enable its readers to meet, objections which the unbelieving Jews urged against Christianity, and which many Jewish Christians urged against Paul's view of it. The strength of the prejudice against himself personally which the Apostle of the Gentiles had to encounter, is shown by the earnestness of his asseveration in ver. 1.

¹ So Theophylact, on vv. 1, 2 :—Μέλλει προῦν δεῖξαι, ὅτι οὐ πάντες οἱ ἐξ Ἀβραὰμ σπέρμα αὐτοῦ εἰσι. Καὶ ἵνα μὴ δόξη κατ' ἐμπάθειαν ταῦτα λέγειν, προλαμβάνει, καὶ λέγει περὶ τῶν Ἑβραίων τὰ χρηστότερα, τὴν ὑπόνοιαν ταύτην ἀναιρῶν, καὶ ὁμολογεῖ αὐτοὺς ὑπερβαλλόντως φιλεῖν. And on vv. 4, 5 :—Ἐπαινεῖ τούτους ἐν ταῦθα καὶ μεγαλύνει, ἵνα, ὅπερ ἔφην, μὴ δόξη κατ' ἐμπάθειαν λέγειν. Ἡρῆμα δὲ καὶ ἐπαινίττεται, ὅτι ὁ μὲν θεὸς ἠβούλετο αὐτοὺς σωθῆναι κ.τ.λ. So also, in the main, Theodoret, Calvin, Locke, and especially Flacius Illyricus, whose notes on vv. 1, 3, and 4 are very much to the point. Dr. Hodge has stated his view of the Apostle's purpose in almost the same language as I have used above. (See *Journal*, p. 91, note ; see also Dr. Dwight, *ibid.*, p. 41.)

the position of *ἐυλογητός*, are pointed out on pp. 88 f., 90 ff., and 104 f. of the *Journal*, and I need not repeat what is there said.

ὁ ὤν.

In Dr. Gifford's remarks on ὁ ὤν (p. 46), he speaks of my "gratuitous assumption that ὁ ὤν, in this passage, 'admits of being regarded as the subject of an independent sentence,'" and affirms that this "is simply . . . begging the whole question in dispute." It is so if "admits of being regarded" is synonymous with "*must* be regarded"; not otherwise. That ὁ ὤν, grammatically considered (and it is of this point that I was speaking), may either refer to the preceding ὁ χριστός, or introduce an independent sentence, is simply a thing plain on the face of the passage. If Dr. Gifford denies this, he not only contradicts the authorities he cites, who only contend that it is *more* naturally connected with what goes before, but virtually charges such scholars as Winer, Fritzsche, Meyer, Ewald, Van Hengel, Professor Campbell, Professor Kennedy, Professor Jowett, Dr. Hort, Lachmann, and Kuenen and Cobet, with ignorance or violation of the laws of the Greek language in the construction which they have actually given the passage.

In reply to Dr. Dwight, who admits that the construction of this passage is ambiguous, but makes a statement about "cases similar to that which is here presented," I remark that no similar case of ambiguity from the use of the participle with the article has ever, to my knowledge, been pointed out, so that we have no means of comparing this passage with a similar one. Dr. Gifford seems to argue from this (p. 46) that there is no ambiguity here. But I fail to perceive any coherence in his reasoning. He "concludes" that St. Paul "could not possibly have intended his words to bear" an ambiguous construction "in a passage of the highest doctrinal importance." Certainly. No writer, whose object is to express and not to conceal his thoughts, *intentionally* uses ambiguous language. But how does this prove that the language here is not actually ambiguous? The fact that it is so is plain; and it is also obvious that, had the Apostle intended to express the meaning conveyed by Dr. Gifford's construction, all ambiguity would have been prevented by using ὅς ἐστιν instead of ὁ ὤν.

If Dr. Gifford's proposition, "The reference of ὁ ὤν not ambiguous" (p. 45), denies a *grammatical* ambiguity here, it denies, as I have said, what is plain on the face of the passage, and what is generally, if not universally, admitted by competent scholars; if, on the other hand, conceding the grammatical possibility of two different constructions of ὁ ὤν here, he affirms that there is no *real* ambiguity, because

he deems the one he adopts the only one tenable, he simply begs the whole question.

It is true, as Dr. Gifford observes, that in the cases in the New Testament in which $\delta \omega \nu$ introduces an independent sentence, no other construction is grammatically possible. But it is equally true, on the other hand, that in the cases in which $\delta \omega \nu$ refers to a preceding subject, no other construction is grammatically possible. It follows that the examples of the use of $\delta \omega \nu$ in the New Testament do not help us to decide which of the two possible constructions is the more probable here. There are no "cases similar to that which is here presented." Dr. Gifford's claim that 2 Cor. xi. 31 is similar will be examined presently.

On what ground, then, is it affirmed that the construction which refers $\delta \omega \nu$ to $\delta \chi \rho \iota \sigma \tau \acute{o} \varsigma$ is "easier" here than that which makes it the subject of an independent sentence? There is not the slightest grammatical difficulty in either. Nor is there the slightest difficulty in the latter construction, on account of the fact that the verb is not *expressed*. In the case of a doxology, which the Ἀμήν naturally suggests, the ellipsis of $\epsilon \sigma \tau \acute{\iota}$ or $\epsilon \dot{\iota} \eta$, when $\epsilon \dot{\iota} \lambda \omicron \gamma \eta \tau \acute{o} \varsigma$ is employed, is the constant usage; nor is there any grammatical difficulty in the construction adopted by Professor Kennedy.

It has indeed been asserted by many, as by Dr. Gifford for example, that the construction of the $\delta \omega \nu$, for which he contends here, is the "usual" one, and, therefore, more easy and natural. But the examples which I have cited of the other construction disprove this assertion, and also show that, in general, the construction of the participle with the article in the nominative case, as the subject of an independent sentence, is much more common in the New Testament than that which refers it to a substantive preceding. (See *Journal*, etc., p. 97.)

In one respect, and one only, so far as I can see, the construction which refers $\delta \omega \nu$ to $\delta \chi \rho \iota \sigma \tau \acute{o} \varsigma$ may be regarded as the more natural. It is the one which naturally presents itself first to the mind. But it has this advantage only for a moment; as the reader proceeds, he perceives at once that $\delta \omega \nu$ may introduce an independent sentence, and the Ἀμήν suggests a doxology. Even more may be said: the separation of $\delta \omega \nu$ from $\delta \chi \rho \iota \sigma \tau \acute{o} \varsigma$ by $\tau \acute{o} \kappa \alpha \tau \grave{\alpha} \sigma \acute{\alpha} \rho \kappa \alpha$, and the necessary pause after $\sigma \acute{\alpha} \rho \kappa \alpha$, might at once suggest that $\delta \omega \nu$ (not "who is," but "he who is") may introduce a new sentence. But waiving this possibility, as soon as it is perceived that the passage admits grammatically of two constructions, the question which is the more natural does

not depend at all on the fact that the one presented itself to the mind a moment before the other, but must be determined by weighing all the considerations which bear on the subject. One of these considerations, second to no other in importance, is Paul's use of language. In the eight preceding chapters of the Epistle the Apostle has used the word *θεός* as a proper name, designating the "one God, the Father," about eighty-seven times, and has nowhere applied it to Christ. Could anything then be more natural than for the primitive reader of the Epistle to adopt the construction which accords with this *uniform* usage of the writer?

On p. 48 Dr. Gifford claims that 2 Cor. xi. 31 is "exactly similar in form" to Rom. ix. 5, and, therefore, proves "that the clause *ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων κ.τ.λ.* must, according to Paul's usage, be referred to the preceding subject *ὁ χριστός*"; and he again speaks of the "exact correspondence between the two passages." He overlooks two fundamental differences: (1) that in 2 Cor. xi. 31 the construction which refers the *ὁ ὢν* to *ὁ θεός κ.τ.λ.* is the only one *possible*; and (2) that what precedes the *ὁ ὢν* does not, as he incorrectly affirms, form a sentence "grammatically complete," as in Rom. ix. 5; but on the contrary, an essential part of the sentence, the object of the transitive verb *οἶδεν* (namely, *ὅτι οὐ ψεύδομαι*), is separated from the verb which governs it by the clause introduced by *ὁ ὢν*.

Distinction between θεός and κύριος.

In regard to the distinction between *θεός* and *κύριος*, which Dr. Gifford charges me with having "asserted in a most inaccurate form" (*Letter*, p. 12), I cannot perceive that he has pointed out any inaccuracy in my statement. That the word *θεός* in general expresses a higher dignity than *κύριος* seems to me beyond question. The use of *κύριος* in the Septuagint as a proper name, taking the place of Jehovah on account of a Jewish superstition respecting the pronunciation of the *tetragrammaton*, is something wholly exceptional and peculiar. I have not, however, as Dr. Gifford incorrectly represents, "suppressed all reference" to this very frequent use in the Septuagint, and occasional use in the New Testament. I note the fact that "it is seldom used of God in the writings of Paul except in quotations from or references to the language of the Old Testament," and then remark upon its two-fold use as applied to God in the Septuagint. (See *Journal*, pp. 127, 128.) That as a title of Christ it does not stand for Jehovah is fully shown, I think, by Cremer in his *Biblisch-theologisches Wörterbuch der Neutest. Gräcität*, 3te Aufl., p. 483 ff., or

Eng. trans., 2d ed., p. 382 ff. The argument that as a designation of Christ in the writings of St. Paul it is equivalent to Jehovah, because in a very few places he applies to Christ language of the Old Testament in which *κύριος* represents Jehovah, loses all its apparent force when we observe the extraordinary freedom with which he adapts the language of the Old Testament to his purpose without regard to its meaning in the connection in which it stands. On this it may be enough to refer to Weiss, *Bibl. Theol. of the N. T.*, 3d ed., § 74. He remarks: "Paul does not inquire into the original meaning of Old Testament expressions; he takes them in the sense which he is accustomed to give to similar expressions, even in the case of such terms as *πίστις, κύριος, εὐαγγελίζεσθαι* (Rom. i. 17, ix. 33, x. 13, 15)."

In the passage of the Old Testament (Ps. cx. 1) which Christ himself has quoted (Matt. xxii. 43-45; Mark xii. 35-37; Luke xx. 41-44) as illustrating the meaning of *κύριος* as a designation of the Messiah, the Messiah (if the Psalm refers to him) is clearly distinguished from Jehovah, at whose right hand he sits, as he is everywhere else in the Old Testament.¹ This very passage is also quoted by the Apostle Peter as proving that "God hath MADE Jesus both *Lord* and Christ." When these and other facts are adduced to show that the term "Lord" as applied to Christ in the New Testament does not stand for Jehovah, but describes the dignity and dominion conferred upon him by God, Dr. Gifford simply remarks that "this reasoning has been employed again and again in the Arian and Unitarian controversies, and again and again refuted." I wonder how many of his readers would regard this as a satisfactory answer to my quotations (if he had *given* them) from the Apostles Peter and Paul, or are ready to assume, with St. Jerome, that *Dominatio* involves *Deitas*. The "refutations" to which Dr. Gifford refers, "again and again" repeated, do not appear to have been convincing to those to whom they were addressed.

Dr. Gifford refers to Waterland, Pearson, and Weiss. Weiss has already been sufficiently answered by Weiss; see above. Waterland and Pearson cite such passages as Hosea i. 7, "I will save them by Jehovah their God, and will not save them by bow, nor by sword, nor by battle, nor by horses, nor by horsemen," as proving that Jesus Christ is called Jehovah in the Old Testament. (Pearson, *Expos.*

¹ See, for example, Micah v. 4: "And he shall stand and feed in the strength of Jehovah, in the majesty of the name of Jehovah, HIS GOD."

of the Creed, p. 217 f., Nichols's ed.) Pearson cites to the same purpose Zech. x. 12; Jer. xxiii. 5, 6 (comp. Jer. xxxiii. 15, 16); Zech. ii. 10, and other passages. Such exegesis might perhaps be pardoned in the time of Pearson and Waterland, though commentators like Calvin, Pocock, Drusius, Grotius, and Le Clerc had rejected this wild interpretation; but it can hardly be supposed that it needs a formal refutation at the present day. It may be enough to refer Dr. Gifford to "The Speaker's Commentary" on the passages mentioned, and the note in the *Journal* for 1881, p. 124.

Origen.

Dr. Gifford still appeals to Rufinus's translation of Origen's Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans as proving that Origen "certainly" interpreted the last part of Rom. ix. 5 as he does (*Letter*, pp. 32 ff., 65). His positiveness is not abated by the circumstance that Rufinus so altered, abridged, and interpolated this work of Origen, that for the most part we have no means of determining what belongs to Origen and what to Rufinus, and that his friends thought he ought to claim it as his own.¹

Dr. Gifford gives his readers no hint of this important fact, of which he could not have been ignorant, and for which I had cited Matthaei, Redepenning, and Rufinus himself (*Journal*, p. 135). There is perhaps no higher authority in Patrology than Cave, who, in his list of Origen's writings, thus describes the work on which Dr. Gifford relies with so much confidence: "*In Epistolam ad Romanos Commentariorum tomi 20. quos pessima fide a se versos, misere interpolatos, detruncatos et ad mediam fere partem contractos edidit Rufinus, versione sua in 10. tomos distributa.*"—*Hist. Lit. s.v. ORIGENES*, i., 118 ed. Oxon. 1740. Thomasius, in his valuable work on Origen, was more prudent in his use of authorities. He says: "Am wenigsten aber wagte ich den Commentar zu den Römern zu benützen, der nach der *Peroratio Rufini in explanationem Origenis super Epist. Pauli ad Rom.* Vol. iv. eine gänzliche Umgestaltung durch den Uebersetzer erfahren zu haben scheint." (*Origenes* (1837), p. 90.) Even Burton, who in his very one-sided *Testimonies of the Ante-*

¹ "Adversus hanc audaciam excandescit Erasmus, nec immerito quidam Rufinum objurgarunt, quemadmodum ipse sibi objectum fuisse ait in peroratione suae translationis, quod suum potius, quam Origenis nomen hujus operis titulo non inscripsisset. Hinc etiam fit, ut vix Origenem in Origene reperias," etc. — Lumper, *Hist. theol.-crit.*, etc. Pars ix. (1792), p. 191.

Nicene Fathers, etc., quotes largely from spurious works ascribed to Hippolytus and Dionysius of Alexandria without giving any warning to the reader, could not bring himself to cite Rufinus's transformation of Origen's Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. (See *Testimonies*, etc., 2d ed., p. 339.)

Dr. Gifford's citations from the treatise of Origen against Celsus do not appear to me to answer his purpose. He quotes passages (*Cont. Cels.* i. 60, 66 ; ii. 9) in which Origen has called Christ *θεός*, but in the last one adduced (ii. 9) the words at the end of the sentence, *κατὰ τὸν τῶν ὅλων θεὸν καὶ πατέρα*, as De la Rue remarks, "manifestam continent antithesin ad ista, *μεγάλην ὄντα δύναμιν καὶ θεόν, ut pater supra filium evehatur.*"¹ What is wanted is to show that Origen has not merely given Christ the appellation *θεός*, "a divine being," in contradistinction from *ὁ θεός*, *ὁ τῶν ὅλων θεός*, *ὁ ἐπὶ πάντι θεός*, by which titles he constantly designates the Father, but that he has called him "God over all," as he is represented as making St. Paul do in this so-called translation of Rufinus. It is the Father alone who in the passages cited by Dr. Gifford (*Cont. Cels.* viii. 4, 12) is termed *ὁ ἐπὶ πάντι θεός*; in viii. 14 of the same treatise Origen emphatically denies that the generality of Christians regarded the Saviour as "the God over all"; and in the next section he expressly calls him "inferior" to the Father (*ὑποδεέστερος*), as he elsewhere speaks of him as *ἐλάττων πρὸς τὸν πατέρα* and *δεύτερος τοῦ πατρὸς* (*De Princip.* i. 3, § 5), and says that "he is excelled by the Father as much as (or even more than) he and the Holy Spirit excel other beings," and that "in no respect does he compare with the Father" (*οὐ συγκρίνεται κατ' οὐδὲν τῷ πατρί*, *In Joan.* tom. xiii. c. 25 ; *Opp.* iv. 235). It is not easy to believe that one who uses such language as this applied the last clause of Rom. ix. 5 to Christ.

¹ De la Rue understands the *κατά* to denote "inferiorem ordinem," and says it is often so used. I doubt this, and if the word is genuine, should rather take it as meaning "in accordance with the will of," or "by the will of," nearly as in the phrase *κατὰ θεόν* in Plato, Aristotle, and other Greek authors. But it seems to me very probable that the true reading is *μετά*; comp. Orig. *In Joannem* tom. i. c. 11, *τὸν μετὰ τὸν πατέρα τῶν ὅλων θεὸν λόγον*; Justin Mart. *Apol.* i. 32, *ἡ πρώτη δύναμις μετὰ τὸν πατέρα πάντων καὶ δεσπότην θεόν* (and similarly *Apol.* i. 12, 13; ii. 13); Euseb. *De Eccl. Theol.* i. 20, p. 93 c., *κύριος τῶν ὅλων μετὰ τὸν ἐπὶ πάντων θεόν*. The prepositions *κατά* and *μετά* are very often confounded in MSS. by an error of the scribe, the abbreviations for the two words being similar. (Montfaucon, *Palaeogr. Graeca*, p. 345; Sabas, *Specim. Palaeogr.*, Suppl., tabb. xi., xii.) See Bast ad Gregor. Corinth. ed. Schaefer (1811), pp. 69, 405, 825, and Irmisch's Hierodian iv. 1638, who gives eight examples. Cobet remarks:

In the passage *Cont. Cels.* viii. 4, I perceive no ground for regarding the titles τὸν ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεὸν τῶν θεῶν, and τὸν ἐπὶ πᾶσι κύριον τῶν κυρίων, as denoting equal dignity. The latter, high as it is, as applied to Christ, is far from proving that he might be called ἐπὶ πάντων θεός. The last sentence quoted by Dr. Gifford shows the distinction. The purport of it is that "he has risen to the GOD OVER ALL who worships HIM undividedly" (this is said in opposition to the worship of the heathen, distributed among many gods), "through him who alone leads men to God, namely, the Son, the God-Logos and Wisdom," etc. The relation of the Son to the Father, from whom he has derived all that makes him an object of worship, and whose image he is, is such, according to Origen, that the relative worship paid to him is all *ultimately* paid to the God over all, the Father, who alone is the Supreme Object of worship.

Still less, if possible, is the quotation from *Cont. Cels.* viii. 12 to Dr. Gifford's purpose. It teaches, he says, "that Christ is to be worshipped as being One with the Supreme God." "One" in what sense? Dr. Gifford omits the words that immediately follow, in which Origen cites Acts iv. 32, "And the multitude of believers were of one heart and one soul," as explaining the meaning of the words, "I and the Father are one."¹ A little further on Origen says: "We worship, then, the Father of the Truth, and the Son, who is the Truth;² two distinct persons, but one in agreement of thought, and in harmony of feeling, and in sameness of will," ὄντα δύο τῇ ὑποστάσει πράγματα, ἐν δὲ τῇ ὁμοιοῖα, καὶ τῇ συμφωνίᾳ, καὶ τῇ ταυτότητι τοῦ βουλήματος; so that he

"Qui codices Graecos triverunt sciunt κατὰ et μετὰ compendiose sic scribi ut vix oculis discerni possint. Passim confundi solere sciunt omnes."—*Variae Lectiones*, in *Mnemosyne* vii. 391.

Dr. Gifford may prefer Burton's view, who says (*Testimonies*, etc., 2d ed., p. 293), it "can only mean 'God after the pattern of the God of the universe.'" It would take too much space to give my reasons for differing from him. Martini says (p. 175), "Entweder ist es s. v. a. *per deum* [there is some mistake here, perhaps only a comma omitted] *cuius auctor est summus deus*, oder *secundum voluntatem summi dei*." Mosheim renders it *nächst*; Rössler, *nach*; Crombie and Prof. Kennedy, *next to*. These translations rather represent μετὰ, but show what the translators thought the context to require, and may thus be regarded as confirming my conjecture.

¹ So in his *Comm. in Joan.* tom. xiii. c. 34, Opp. iv. 245, Origen explains John x. 30, as relating to the unity of *will* between the Father and the Son.

² Comp. Origen, *In Joan.* tom. ii. c. 18, Opp. iv. 76^b: ὁ πατὴρ τῆς ἀληθείας θεὸς πλείων ἐστὶ καὶ μείζων ἢ [we should read, perhaps, ἢ ἢ] ἀλήθεια: "the God who is the Father of the Truth is more and greater than the Truth."

who has seen the Son . . . has seen in him, who is the image of God, God himself.”¹

In the view of Origen, the moral union between the Father and the Son was perfect, so that the worship of the Son, regarded as the image of the Father, reflecting his moral perfections, his goodness and righteousness and truth, is virtually the worship of the Father himself; it terminates in him as its ultimate object. (See *Cont. Cels.* viii. 13 *ad fin.*)

Origen's ideas respecting the worship of the Son appear distinctly in what he says of prayer. In his treatise on Prayer, he teaches that prayer, properly speaking, is “perhaps never to be offered to any originated being, *not even to Christ himself*, but only to the God and Father of all, to whom our Saviour himself prayed and teaches us to pray.” (*De Orat.* c. 15; *Opp.* i. 222.) There is much more to the same purpose. In his later work against Celsus, he says that “every supplication and prayer, and intercession, and thanksgiving is to be sent up to the GOD OVER ALL, *through* the High Priest, who is above all angels, the living Logos, and God. But we shall also supplicate the Logos himself, and make requests to him, and give thanks and pray, if we are able to distinguish between prayer properly speaking and prayer in a looser sense, *ἐὰν δυνώμεθα κατακοῦειν τῆς περὶ προσευχῆς κυριολεξίας καὶ καταχρήσεως.*” (*Cont. Cels.* v. 4, and see also v. 5; *Opp.* i. 580.) Compare *Cont. Cels.* viii. 26: “We ought to pray only to the GOD OVER ALL; yet it is proper to pray also to the only-begotten, the first-born of the whole creation, the Logos of God, and to request him, as a High Priest, to carry up our prayers which reach him to HIS GOD and our God.” So *Cont. Cels.* viii. 13: “We worship the one God, and the one Son, who is his Logos and Image, with supplications and petitions as we are able, bringing our prayers to the GOD OF THE UNIVERSE *through* his only-begotten Son, to whom we first offer them; beseeching him, who is the propitiation for our sins, to present, as High Priest, our prayers and sacrifices and intercessions to the GOD OVER ALL.”²

¹ It may be well to notice here an ambiguous sentence in this section, which has been translated, incorrectly, I think, “We worship one God, therefore, the Father and the Son, as we have explained.” The Greek is, *ἐνα οὖν θεόν, ὡς ἀποδεδώκαμεν, τὸν πατέρα [.] καὶ τὸν υἱὸν θεραπεύομεν.* We should, I believe, place a comma after *πατέρα*, and translate, “We worship, therefore, one God, the Father, and the Son.” This is confirmed by what follows, cited above, and by the language used in the next section (c. 13): *διὸ τὸν ἐνα θεόν, καὶ τὸν ἐνα υἱὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ λόγον καὶ εἰκόνα . . . σέβομεν.*

² It may be worth while to note that Origen (*Cont. Cels.* viii. 9) justifies the

I do not see how any one can read these passages and regard it as probable, much less as *certain*, that Origen understood Paul in Rom. ix. 5 to describe Christ as ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεός, εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. It is clear, at any rate, that he did not understand the passage as Dr. Gifford does (*Letter*, p. 3), as "a testimony to the co-equal Godhead of the Son."

Dr. Gifford's argument from the *Selecta in Threnos*, iv. 5, rests on a false assumption, which has been already sufficiently remarked upon.

Punctuation in MSS.

On p. 36 of Dr. Gifford's *Letter*, speaking of punctuation in MSS., he observes that "it is universally acknowledged that no marks of punctuation or division were in use till long after the days of St. Paul." This remark, if intended to apply to Greek MSS. in general, is inaccurate, and indicates that Dr. Gifford has been misled by untrustworthy authorities. If it is intended to apply to New Testament MSS., I do not see how the fact can be proved, as we possess no MSS. of the New Testament of earlier date than the fourth century. But the essential point in Dr. Gifford's remarks is, that the punctuation in MSS. of the New Testament is *of no authority*. This is very true; and it should have been remembered by the many commentators (including Dr. Gifford) who have made the assertion (very incorrect in point of fact), that a stop after σάρκα is found in only two or three inferior MSS. in Rom. ix. 5, as if that were an argument against a doxology here.

The results of some recent investigation in regard to this matter are given in our *Journal* for 1882, p. 161. The investigation has since, through the kindness of Dr. C. R. Gregory, been carried somewhat farther. I can now name, besides the uncials A, B, C, L, the first three of which are not "inferior MSS.," at least twenty-six cursives which have a stop after σάρκα, the same in general which they have after αἰῶνας or Ἀμήν. In all probability, the result of an examination would show that three-quarters or four-fifths of the cursive MSS. containing Rom. ix. 5 have a stop after σάρκα.

In regard to Codex A, Canon Cook thinks the testimony of Dr. Vance Smith, whom Dr. Gifford cites as saying that the stop after

honor paid to the Son on the ground that he receives it by the appointment of the Father (ἀποδείξομεν ὅτι ἀπὸ θεοῦ δέδοται αὐτῷ τὸ τιμᾶσθαι, citing John v. 23), and is declared by God to be ἄξιον τῆς δευτερευούσης μετὰ τὸν θεὸν τῶν ὧλων . . . τιμῆς. (*Cont. Cels.* v. 57.)

σάρκα is "evidently a *prima manu*," is "not verified or likely to be verified."¹ Many others will question the testimony of a Unitarian heretic. It would have been only fair, therefore, to have added the fact, mentioned on p. 150 of the *Journal*, that Dr. Sanday agrees with him. I would add that I am informed, on good authority, that Dr. Scrivener has examined the MS. at this place with the same result.

The whole matter is in itself unimportant; but it is important that writers like Dean Burgon should cease imposing upon unlearned readers by making reckless assertions about it.

Van Hengel on the τὸ κατὰ σάρκα.

As regards the limitation τὸ κατὰ σάρκα (*Letter*, p. 38 f.), the examples cited by Van Hengel from Plato's *Philebus* (c. 7, p. 17^e) and Isocrates (*ad Nicocl.* c. 29 *al.* 30) in support of his view, and urged by Dr. Gifford in opposition to it, are, I think, not to the purpose on either side. The formulæ "A and also B," and "not only A, but B," into which the quotations, so far as they bear on the matter, may be resolved, do not express "antithesis," but agreement. Dr. Gifford's citation from Demosthenes (*cont. Eubul.* p. 1229, l. 14) furnishes no analogy to the τὸ κατὰ σάρκα here, and is wholly irrelevant, for two reasons: (1) because the τὸ καθ' ὑμᾶς [*al.* ἡμᾶς] is introduced with a μὲν, which of course leads one to expect an antithesis, such as follows, expressed by δέ; and (2) because the τὸ καθ' ὑμᾶς is probably to be regarded as the direct object of the verb *θαρρεῖν*, used here, as often, transitively, like its opposite *φοβεῖσθαι*. Van Hengel's rule relates only to clauses like τὸ κατ' ἐμέ, τὸ ἐξ ὑμῶν, in which the article τὸ with its adjunct is neither the object nor the subject of a verb, or at least of any verb expressed. (See Van Hengel, *Interp. Ep. Pauli ad Rom.* ii. 348.)

Irenæus.

As to the quotation of Rom. ix. 5 by Irenæus (*Hær.* iii. 16, § 3), I must still, for the reasons assigned in the *Journal* (p. 136), regard it as doubtful whether he referred the last clause of the verse to Christ. In opposition to the Gnostics who held that the *Æon Christ* first descended upon Jesus at his baptism, Irenæus is quoting passages which, like ἐξ ὧν ὁ χριστὸς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, speak of the *Christ* as *born*. But why, Dr. Gifford asks, does he quote the remainder of the passage if it had nothing to do with his argument? (*Letter*, p. 42.) I answer, he may well have included it in his quotation, if he regarded it as a

¹ Canon Cook, *Revised Version of the first three Gospels*, p. 194; comp. p. 167.

doxology, or gave it Dr. Kennedy's construction, for the same purpose as Photius has quoted it in his work against the Manichæans (*see Journal*, p. 138 f.), namely, as confirming the doctrine insisted on throughout his book, that the God of the Jews, the God of the Old Testament, was not, as all the Gnostics contended, a being inferior to the Supreme God, but the God over all. So understood, it would agree with the language which Irenæus uses so often elsewhere, describing the Father as the God over all, while he nowhere, to my knowledge, speaks of the Son as God over all. I admit that Irenæus *may* have applied the last clause to Christ, separating the *θεός* from *ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων* as a distinct predicate; but I perceive nothing which determines with certainty the construction he gave it. The whole question is of the least possible consequence. One who could treat 2 Cor. iv. 4 as he has done (*Hæc.* iii. 7, § 1; iv. 29, § 2), is certainly no authority in exegesis in a case where doctrinal prejudice could have an influence.

Dr. Gifford thinks that Irenæus "most probably" refers to Rom. ix. 5 when he says (*Hæc.* iii. 12, § 9) that the mystery which was made known to Paul by revelation was that *ὁ παθὼν ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου οὗτος κύριος τῶν πάντων καὶ βασιλεὺς καὶ θεὸς καὶ κριτὴς ἐστίν*. He omits the words that *immediately* follow, preserved in the old Latin version: "ab eo qui est omnium Deus accipiens potestatem, quoniam subiectus factus est usque ad mortem, mortem autem crucis," where Christ as *θεός* is distinguished from him who is "omnium Deus," from whom he received his power. This does not go far towards proving that Irenæus would call *Christ* "God over all." I observe incidentally that Irenæus's explanation of "the mystery which was made known to Paul by revelation" (Eph. iii. 3) differs widely from that which Paul himself gives (Eph. iii. 6 ff.).

Clement of Rome.

Passing to p. 41 of Dr. Gifford's *Letter*, I remark that if Clement of Rome in the passage cited (*Cor.* c. 32) had Rom. ix. 5 in mind, as he probably did, and regarded the last clause as applicable to Christ, it would have been altogether to his purpose to have added it to the *τὸ κατὰ σάρκα*, his purpose being to magnify the distinctions bestowed by God on the patriarch Jacob. Dr. Gifford will not, I think, find many who will regard the simple expression "the Lord Jesus" as equivalent to "He who is over all, God blessed for ever"; it is rather the equivalent of the Pauline *ὁ χριστός*, a title which, when it denotes the Messiah, involves lordship. So far, then, from inferring, as Dr. Gifford does, from this passage of Clement, that he "probably"

(*Letter*, p. 65) applied the last clause to Christ, I should infer from his omitting it, where, thus understood, it would have been so much to his purpose, that he probably did *not*. This presumption would be confirmed by the way in which he speaks of Christ, and distinguishes him from God, throughout his Epistle.

The Newly-discovered Quotation of Rom. ix. 5 by Irenæus.

Dr. Gifford (*Letter*, p. 41) adduces a passage from Irenæus, "which no one," he observes, "so far as I know, has hitherto noticed in this connection. Prof. Abbot indeed says (p. 136) that the only place where Irenæus has quoted Rom. ix. 5 is *Hær.* iii. 16 (*al.* 18), § 3. Alas! for the man who ventures on that spirited but dangerous hobby, the universal négative. These are the words of Irenæus in *Fragm. xvii.* (Stieren): ἐξ ὧν ὁ χριστὸς προετυπώθη καὶ ἐπεγνώσθη καὶ ἐγενήθη. ἐν μὲν γὰρ τῷ Ἰωσήφ προετυπώθη· ἐκ δὲ τοῦ Δευὶ καὶ τοῦ Ἰούδα τὸ κατὰ σάρκα ὡς βασιλεὺς καὶ ἱερεὺς ἐγενήθη."

Dr. Gifford has fortunately given the Greek of the passage that is to put me to shame, and I have not the slightest apprehension that any reader of his *Letter* will call the fragment of Irenæus which he cites a quotation of Rom. ix. 5; at the very utmost it could only be termed an *allusion* to that passage. The editor of the *Σκύρα* or *Catena* from which this fragment is taken (Nicephorus Theotoki), and the editors and translators of Irenæus, as Grabe, Massuet, Stieren, Migne, Harvey, Roberts and Rambaut, and Keble, though they all refer in the margin to supposed quotations, have failed to make any reference here to Rom. ix. 5. If it be a quotation, the discovery of the fact belongs probably to Dr. Gifford alone. It will be observed that Dr. Gifford spaces the letters in ἐξ ὧν ὁ χριστός as if they must be regarded as *quoted* from Rom. ix. 5. He does not note the fact that this fragment of Irenæus is part of a comment on Deut. xxvii. 12, and is given in a fuller form in a Latin translation by Franciscus Zephyrus or Zephyrius (= Zafiri) in his edition of a *Catena* on Deuteronomy, as cited by Grabe in his edition of Irenæus (p. 469). This reads: "Notandum, benedicendi munus in tribus demandatum, ex quibus Christus designatus cognoscitur et generatur," etc., and shows how little the ἐξ ὧν κ.τ.λ. has to do with Rom. ix. 5, and how groundless is the inference which Dr. Gifford draws from this accidental coincidence of expression.

Long before Dr. Gifford's *Letter* was published I had noted this fragment, together with a similar passage in Irenæus (*Hær.* iv. 4, § 1) as examples of τὸ κατὰ σάρκα without an antithesis expressed, and had

caused them to be printed among the Additions and Corrections in the number of the *Journal* for 1882, p. 160, referring to the *Journal* for 1881, p. 101. So far as they go, they both, I think, favor my view of the controverted passage rather than Dr. Gifford's. If they are to be regarded as *quotations* of Rom. ix. 5, they favor it more than I had supposed.

Position of εὐλογητός.

In Dr. Gifford's remarks on the position of εὐλογητός (*Letter*, p. 54 f.), he maintains that in the text of the Septuagint, in Ps. lxviii. 20 (Sept. lxvii. 19), εὐλογητός should be read but once, and connected with what follows. For this, so far as I can ascertain, he has the authority of only two unimportant cursive MSS. (Nos. 183, 202),—in which the omission of one εὐλογητός is readily explained as accidental, on account of the *homæoteleuton* or dittography,—in opposition to all the other known MSS. of the Psalms, more than a hundred in number, including the uncials, among them **Σ** and B of the fourth century, and the Verona MS. of the fifth or sixth. (The Alexandrian MS. and the Zürich Psalter are mutilated here.) The omission of the first εὐλογητός, moreover, leaves the κύριος ὁ θεός simply hanging in the air, without any construction. To adopt such a reading in the face of such evidence is to do violence to all rational principles of textual criticism. The difference between the LXX and the Hebrew is easily explained by the supposition that in the Hebrew copy used by the translators, the כבוד was repeated (which might easily have happened), or at least that they thought it ought to be.

Dr. Gifford takes no notice of my explanation of the *reason* for the ordinary position of such words as εὐλογητός, εὐλογημένος, ἐπικατάρατος, etc., in doxologies, benedictions, and maledictions, or of the exceptions which I adduce (save Ps. lxviii. 20, which I waive), or of my argument that if we take the last clause as a doxology, the position of εὐλογητός after the subject is not only fully accounted for, but is rather *required by the very same law of the Greek language*, which governs all the examples that have been alleged against the doxological construction. (*Journal*, pp. 103-111.) As this view is supported by so eminent a grammarian as Winer, to say nothing of Meyer, Fritzsche, and other scholars, it seems to me that it deserved consideration.

Different Senses of εὐλογητός.

On p. 56 of Dr. Gifford's *Letter*, he gives as examples of the use and meaning of the word εὐλογητός the expressions "Blessed be God"

and "Blessed be thou of the Lord," and remarks that "Dr. Abbot 'overlooks the fact' that, whatever difference there may be, it lies *not in the sense of the word* εὐλογητός, but in the different relations of the persons blessing and blessed." I must confess that I have overlooked the fact, if it be a fact; and must also confess my belief that not a few of Dr. Gifford's readers will be surprised at the proposition that there is no difference in the sense of the word εὐλογητός when, applied to God, it means "praised" or "worthy to be praised," and when, applied to men, it means "prospered" or "blessed" by God. The fact on which Dr. Gifford seems to lay great stress, that εὐλογητός in these different senses represents the same Hebrew word, will not weigh much with those who consider that many words in common use have several very different meanings in Hebrew as well as in other languages. The two meanings are as distinct as those of εὐλογία in the sense of *laus, laudatio, celebratio* (Grimm, *Lex..s.v.* εὐλογία No. 1), and of *bonum, beneficium* (Grimm, *ibid.*, No. 5).

The very common use of εὐλογητός in doxologies to God seems to have led the Septuagint translators to restrict its application in the sense of "praised," or rather "worthy to be praised," to the Supreme Being. To this perhaps the only exception is in the expression εὐλογητὸς ὁ τρόπος σου in 1 Sam. xxv. 33. In the New Testament, apart from the passage in debate, its application is restricted to God, "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." My point is that whatever force there may be in the argument from this extensive usage in favor of its application to God rather than to Christ in Rom. ix. 5, it is not diminished in the slightest degree by the fact that, in a few passages of the LXX the word is applied to men in the very different sense of "prospered" or "recipients of blessings," *i.e.* benefits, from God.

I have now, I believe, taken notice of all the points of importance in which Dr. Gifford has criticised my statements, or statements which he has ascribed to me. I am not without hope that in a future edition of his pamphlet he may see reason for modifying some of his remarks, and for giving more fully the context of some of his quotations.

The Readings Ἑλληνας and Ἑλλημιστάς, Acts xi. 20.

PROF. B. B. WARFIELD, D.D.

THIS is one of the very few passages of importance in the New Testament, in which the reading may be considered with some justice as yet unsettled. The great modern editions from Griesbach to Tregelles — Matthæi alone excepted — are, indeed, unanimous in reading Ἑλληνας.¹ With them most commentators and historical students agree.² There never was a time, however, when Ἑλλημιστάς did not have a respectable following among exegetes.³ And Westcott and Hort have put an end to the unanimity of even the editions. The Revised English New Testament so far follows as to put "Many ancient authorities read *Grecian Jews*" in their margin; although exactly what is meant by this, it is impossible for an outsider to divine, amid the contradictory reports of what the margin was intended for, and the curious distribution of the terms "many," "some," "most," "ancient authorities."

At all events, it is clear that a new discussion of the reading, on its merits, cannot be thought a re-opening of a dispute already practically closed.⁴ What is proposed, is to briefly consider the evidence, and attempt to reach at least a provisional conclusion.

¹ Usher, Grotius, Witsius, and especially Bengel (not in ed. maj., but "Gnomoni et margo, ed. 2 . . . et vers. Germ.," says his son) were their forerunners. Cf. Erasmus and Drusius.

² The following rather miscellaneous list of recent names will show how widely spread the opinion is among English writers: Alford, Farrar, Hackett, Hinds, Howson (in *Life of Paul*), Jacobus, J. B. Lightfoot (in "Galatians"), Norris, Plumptre, Purves, Scrivener, Schaeffer (in *Lange*), Tate, Webster, and Wilkinson (in notes).

³ Among recent English writers there are for this view such as: J. A. Alexander, W. Kay, P. Schaff (*Companion to New Testament*, p. 8, note 2), Shirley, Canon Spence (apparently: in Schaff's *Popular Commentary*, in loc., "On the whole, the evidence is in favor of Ἑλλημιστάς," yet very doubtfully), Bishop Wordsworth, etc.

⁴ The most elaborate recent discussions of this reading in English are probably the following: KAY, W., "*On the Word Hellenist, with Especial Reference to Acts xi. 19 (20)*," Calcutta, 1856 [defends Ἑλλημιστάς]; ALFORD, H., Excursus II. to Prolegomena to Acts in his *Greek Testament* [against Kay, defends Ἑλληνας]; SCRIVENER, F. H., in his *Plain Introduction*, etc., p. 536 of ed. 2, 1874, cf.

The External Evidence.

The essential facts of the evidence are included in the following summary :

For ἑλλημιστάς: [? **Σ***], B, D², E, H, L, P, almost all uncials, all cursives except one (including 13, 61, etc.), [Pst. ?], Eus. [? Chrys.].

For ἑλληνας: **Σ**^c, A, D*, c^{scr.} [= Hort's 112], [? Chrys.].

In explanation of this summary we need to remark :—

(1) C is here defective ; but in no other case in Acts does it desert the mass of documents when they read either ἑλληνες or ἑλλημισταί.

(2) It is exceedingly doubtful whether **Σ*** should be cited for ἑλλημιστάς. It actually reads εὐαγγελιστάς, which is usually assumed to presuppose ἑλλημιστάς, on account of its like termination. But since it seems certain that εὐαγγελιστάς was suggested by, and results from, the proximity of εὐαγγελιζόμενοι, the inference does not seem secure. No doubt ἑλλημιστάς could be more readily than ἑλληνας mistaken for εὐαγγελιστάς ; but if any substantive were derived from εὐαγγελιζόμενοι, it could not fail to take the form εὐαγγελιστάς. It is only with grave doubt, therefore, that the weight of **Σ*** can be thrown in favor of ἑλλημιστάς.

(3) The force of A, as a witness for ἑλληνας, is somewhat weakened by the fact that this MS. reads ἑλληνας also at ix. 29, where the true reading is undoubtedly ἑλλημιστάς. D is defective at ix. 29 ; but, as Mr. Purves notes, both A and D insert καί before ἐλλήνων in xvii. 4 — as do also the good cursives, 13 and 61. If this be due, as he suggests, to a tendency in A and D to put forward the Gentile work of the Church, the testimony of these MSS. here to ἑλληνας should be somewhat suspected. The existence of such a tendency in A and D needs, however, justification.

(4) The versions fail to distinguish between the terms ἑλλημιστάς and ἑλληνας, and hence are not valid witnesses in this matter. Only the Peshitto may be an exception, inasmuch as it reads, at ix. 29, "those Jews who knew Greek" ; but even it reads "Greeks" at vi. 1.

ed. 3, 1883 [defends ἑλληνας] ; HAMMOND, C. E., in his *Outlines of Textual Crit.*, etc., ed. 2, 1876, p. 113 [defends ἑλληνας] ; HORT, F. J. A., in his *Notes on Select Readings*, Gr. Test. vol. II., p. 93, 1881 [defends ἑλλημιστάς] ; PURVES, G. T., "The Reading" ἑλληνας in Acts xi. 20," in *The Presbyterian Review*, vol. IV., p. 835 sq., 1883 [defends ἑλληνας against Hort]. See also the elaborate notes in the critical editions ; in the commentaries of Alford, Wordsworth, Bloomfield, Plumptre and Howson and Spence, *in loc.* ; and in Farrar's *Life of Paul*, I. 285, etc.

(5) Chrysostom (whose words, ἵσως διὰ τὸ μὴ εἰδέναι ἑβραϊστὶ Ἑλλήνας αὐτοὺς ἐκάλουν, both Theophylact and Eucumenius repeat) reads "Greeks" in his commentary clearly, although Ἑλληνιστάς stands in the text commented on. This throws his testimony somewhat in doubt. It may be that the quotation from Acts has been conformed by later copyists to the Syrian type of text (which undoubtedly read Ἑλληνιστάς); or it may be that Chrysostom understood Ἑλληνιστάς as equivalent to Ἑλληνας, either in the general import of the word or in this context, and hence, though reading the former, could cry out, ὦρα, Ἑλλησιν εὐαγγελίζονται. The weight of his evidence for Ἑλληνας is weakened in proportion to the probability of his being able to thus interpret Ἑλληνιστάς.

The evidence being thus before us, its estimation is not without its difficulties, although the issue can scarcely remain doubtful.

The Genealogical Evidence.—The application of genealogical considerations leads immediately to the conclusions that both readings are pre-Syrian, and that neither is Alexandrian in its origin, — as, indeed, the presence of B in the one group and of D* in the other sufficiently evinces. Beyond that, progress is more difficult. It is certainly striking that, with the exception of D*, Ἑλληνας is not supported by any of the typical Western documents. It is not easy to suppose, on the one hand, that Ἑλληνας arose as a Western corruption and yet failed to propagate itself in the later Western texts, or, on the other, that Ἑλληνιστάς was originally Neutral or Neutral-Alexandrian, and thence seeped, by mixture, into all late Western texts. One is almost tempted to suppose the support of Ἑλληνας due to the accidental conformity of independent obvious conjectural emendation. On closer consideration, however, it appears that all the documents which class here with B have Neutral or Neutral-Alexandrian elements; and thus Ἑλληνιστάς is readily accounted for as the Neutral-Alexandrian reading, and Ἑλληνας as the Western. On genealogical considerations, therefore, there is a probability that Ἑλληνιστάς is the more original reading. This probability fails to be decisive only because genealogical evidence only assigns readings to their respective classes, and leaves it to internal evidence to determine the relative purity of the classes; and internal evidence of classes can only determine usual, not invariable, relations. Although, therefore, it is certain that the Neutral-Alexandrian readings are generally better than the Western, the rule is not absolutely without exceptions, and there is a possibility that the present case may be an exception.

Internal Evidence of Groups.—We appeal, consequently, to In-

ternal Evidence of Groups for additional evidence and greater surety. Here we find ourselves embarrassed at once by the doubt resting on the testimony of \aleph^* . If its witness were clearly for ἑλληνιστάς, the known high character of the combination B \aleph , here increased greatly by the adjunction of many other important witnesses, would throw the weight of the external evidence overwhelmingly for that reading. Just in the degree that we judge it probable that the present reading of \aleph^* is only a stupid blunder for ἑλληνιστάς, must the testimony for that reading appear to us to approach the overwhelming point.

Even when we lay aside the testimony of \aleph^* , however, the internal evidence of groups appears still to support ἑλληνιστάς, — B being rarely wrong when in conjunction with such a train as here sides with it.

Still another mode of procedure is open to us, by which we may reach an independent result, and thus test the probabilities already raised. We may try, by internal evidence of groups, the special value of the group which here appears as the evidence for ἑλληνας. We have noted something over a hundred cases in which the group \aleph^c , A, D* occurs in the Book of Acts. In the great majority of these, however, it has either actually or practically the support of all other MSS. except \aleph^* ; in other words; the rival reading is a mere individualism or slip of the careless scribe of \aleph^* , which has been corrected into conformity with the universally supported reading by the scholarly hand whom we know as \aleph^c . These cases are only valuable in helping us estimate the value of \aleph^c , to whom hardly due credit is usually attached. The remaining instances may be conveniently classified as follows: —

(1) Instances in which \aleph^c , A, D* have the support of two or more of the primary documents: ¹—

NO.	ACTS.	READING.	ADDITIONAL SUPPORT.	EDITORS ADOPTING IT.	INTERNAL PROBABILITY.
1	i. 17	ην εν	(\aleph^*) B C E 13, 61, al. vg. Copp.	L. T. Tr. H. A.	right.
2	v. 36	ως	B C E al. ¹⁰ Chrys.	L. T. Tr. H. A.	right.
3	vii. 45	εξωσεν	B C H P al. ^{plu.} Chrys.	L. T. ^{vii.} Tr. H. A.	right.
4	xii. 50	omit και	B C 13, 61, al. Copp. Syrr. etc.	L. T. Tr. H. A.	right.
5	[xvi. 30]	προ-[αγαγων]	(\aleph^*) B C E L P al. 13, 61, al. ^{plu.}	L. T. Tr. H. A.	right.]
6	xvii. 25	και τα παντα	\aleph^* B E al. ¹⁰⁺ vg. Cop. Syr. ^{p.} etc.	L. T. Tr. H. A.	right.

¹ The letters in the fifth column explain themselves: L. = Lachmann; T. = Tischendorf's viii. ed.; T.^{vii.} = Tischendorf's vii. ed.; H. = Westcott and Hort; and A. = Alford.

(2) Instances in which they are supported by B and secondary authorities only :—

7	iv. 34	insert <i>υπηρχον</i>	B E P al. ^{plu.} 13, 61, al. Eus. Chrys.	L. T. Tr. H. A.	right.
8	xiii. 1	<i>τετραρχον</i>	B E H L P al. 13, 61, al.	L. T. ^{vii.} Tr. A.	—
9	xvii. 25	omit <i>ως</i>	B E K L P al. vg. etc. Clem.	L. T. Tr. H. A.	right.
10	xviii. 21	omit <i>και</i> before <i>ανηχθ.</i>	B 8 cursives, vg. Theb. etc.	T. Tr. H. A.	right.
11	xix. 16	omit <i>και</i> before <i>καταχ.</i>	B E ^{gr.} 13, c. ^{scr.} al. ⁶ Copp. etc.	L. T. Tr. H. A.	right.
12	xxii. 28	insert <i>δε και</i>	B E H L P al. ^{plu.} vg. Syrr. Æth. etc.	L. T. Tr. H. A.	right.

(3) Instances in which they are supported by C and secondary authorities only :—

13	i. 11	<i>εμβλεποντες</i>	C al. ^{plu.} Chrys. Cyr. Thdrt. etc.	L. T. ^{vii.} A.	wrong.
14	ii. 26	<i>η καρδ. μου</i> (order)	C E P al. omn. ^{vid.} ex- cept N* B	L.	wrong.
15	iii. 16	insert <i>επι</i>	C E P al. ^{plu.} Copp. vg. etc. Ir.	L. T. Tr. A.	wrong.
16	x. 33	<i>απο</i>	C	L. T. ^{vii.} A.	wrong.
17	xiii. 10	omit <i>του</i> before <i>κυρ.</i>	C E H L P al. omn. ^{vid.} except N* B	L. T. Tr. H. ^{mg.} A.	right?
18	xv. 24	<i>εξεληθοντες</i>	C E P al. ^{plu.} Copp. Syrr. vg. Ir. Or.	L. T. Tr. [Tr. ^{mg.}] A.	right?
19	xvi. 32	[<i>του</i>] <i>κυρ.ον</i>	C E H L P al. omn. ^{vid.} except B N*	L. T. Tr. H. ^{mg.} A.	wrong?
20	xx. 22	<i>μοι</i>	C H L P al. omn. ^{vid.} except B N* [E ^{gr.}]	L. T. ^{vii.} Tr. A.	wrong.

(4) Instances in which they are supported by **N*** and secondary authorities only :—

21	[xxi. 22]	<i>παντ. δει. συνελ. πληθ.</i>	N* C ² E H L P al. ^{plu.} 13, vg.	L. T. A.	[wrong.]
----	-----------	------------------------------------	---	----------	----------

(5) Instances in which they are supported by secondary authorities only :—

22	iii. 22	<i>υμων</i> after <i>θεος</i>	61, al. vg. Ir. Or. Chrys.	L. T. ^{vii.} Tr. A.	wrong.
23	[iv. 18]	<i>το</i> before <i>κα- θολον</i>	E P al. ^{plu.} Chrys.	T. ^{vii.} Tr. A.	wrong?]
24	v. 31	omit <i>του</i> before <i>δον.</i>	E H P al. ^{plu.} Chrys.	L. T. ^{vii.} Tr. [H.] A.	right?
25	[vii. 16]	insert <i>τον</i> be- fore <i>εν.</i>	E H P al. vg. Syr. ^{p.} Æth. Chrys.	L.	wrong.]
26	xi. 20	<i>ελληνας</i>	c. ^{scr.} Arm. Eus. [Chrys.]	L. T. Tr. A.	conflict.
27	xvii. 30	<i>παργγελει</i>	E H L P al. ^{plu.} 13, 61, etc. Cyr.	L. T. ^{vii.} Tr. A.	wrong.
28	xviii. 3	[<i>ηργα-</i>] <i>ετο</i>	E L P vg. Syrr. Arm.	L. T. ^{vii.} Tr. H. ^{mg.} A.	right?
29	xx. 24	[see digests]	13, 40, 43, 68. [vg.]	L.	wrong.

This last list, of course, furnishes the truest parallels to our present passage, and it must be confessed that the most of them are clearly wrong, while none of them are clearly right, and (besides xi. 20) only two seem capable of being plausibly defended. The case is little better with the other instances which lack the support of B; out of nine cases, only three apparently can be plausibly defended, and these are all of such character that internal evidence is of somewhat doubtful value in regard to them. The result of this investigation also, thus, is to discredit *ἔλληνας*.

Three, or perhaps four, independent methods of examining the evidence thus elicits from the external testimony a consentient witness for the probable originality of *ἐλλημιστάς*. The exact force of this cumulative probability is not easy to estimate. It is certainly strong enough to give us full confidence in the correctness of *ἐλλημιστάς*, in the absence of strong rebutting considerations drawn from internal evidence. And in the presence of such rebutting considerations, it is strong enough to demand from us very anxious questionings and very strenuous efforts after harmony before we set it aside.

The Internal Evidence.

Transcriptional Probability.—That the transcriptional probability goes with the external in favor of *ἐλλημιστάς* is scarcely open to doubt. Any ordinary reader would naturally expect *ἔλληνας* here; and, therefore, a scribe, finding it here, would be very unlikely to alter it into the difficult reading and rare word, *ἐλλημιστάς*. This is not to assume in scribes a nice appreciation of the true course of the history, but only a slight attention to the immediate context in its most obvious appearances. The contrast with *Ἰουδαίους* that would inevitably suggest itself to the mind of any copyist would be the standing one, — *ἔλληνας*, — which he would almost venture to write without reference to his copy; only if he had just written *Ἑβραίους*, would he think of *ἐλλημιστάς* as its contrast. The strengthening *καί* before the *πρός* would render it all the more inevitable that he should expect to find, and hence should write, *ἔλληνας*. The general progress of the narrative from v. 19 points in the same direction. All combined renders *ἐλλημιστάς* so difficult a reading as to forbid our supposing that any scribe would (consciously or unconsciously) write it here for *ἔλληνας*, — points out *ἔλληνας* as so obvious a correction as to make it very probable that scribes might even independently (consciously or unconsciously) write it here for *ἐλλημιστάς*.

On the assumption that *ἔλληνας* is the original reading, explanations

of its alteration to ἑλληνιστάς may, no doubt, be suggested by acute minds. Three such, perhaps, deserve consideration: (1) Meyer (whom, among others, Renan follows) very acutely supposes that this reading may have been brought in through a mechanical assimilation of the passage to ix. 29; and he thinks that the fact that codex 40 adds here καὶ συνέζήτουν speaks in favor of this supposition. (2) Others suppose that the ἑλληνας was corrected to ἑλληνιστάς in order to bring the passage into formal harmony with the statement that Cornelius was the first Gentile received into the church, — to which Mr. Purves adds the dogmatic consideration that our MSS. were written when ecclesiastical authority was rising high, and the alteration may have been designed to save the supremacy of the Apostles (in the matter of first bringing Gentiles into the Church). (3) The disturbing effect of εὐαγγελιζόμενοι may be appealed to; its immediate proximity may have exercised a mechanical influence on the scribe's mind or hand, and led him to write -ιστάς instead of -ας. We see an extreme result of this influence in §*. And what happened in the case of one scribe cannot be asserted to be impossible. Nay, may not the error of §* be an inheritance rather than the origination of its scribe? And may we not see here the first step in the origin of the false reading, ἑλληνιστάς, which would be the obvious correction of εὐαγγελιστάς?

No one of these explanations can be pronounced impossible. But the question before us concerns, not impossibilities, but relative probabilities. And all of them are very improbable in comparison with the likelihood of the immediate context having led to a change in the opposite direction. The intrusion of ix. 29 into the mind of the scribe who wrote codex 40 is apparently due to the great similarity of the passages, an important element of which was the presence here of ἑλληνιστάς; it is, therefore, more probably a result than the cause of that reading. Both of the two first of these explanations go too far afield for their reasons, and credit the scribes with too great mental activity. So thoughtful a scribe as the second supposes, for instance, would scarcely fail to be thoughtful enough to see that there was no disaccord between ἑλληνας here and the claims of Cornelius to be the first-fruits of the Gentiles; or, if not, would be stupid enough to be satisfied with the postpositing of this account to that. The influence of dogmatic considerations on the New Testament text can scarcely ever be surely traced, and cannot be assumed to account for such readings as we have before us. And, finally, while it cannot be denied that εὐαγγελιζόμενοι has influenced the mind and hand of the writer

of \aleph^* , and so may have done so elsewhere, it is not very probable that it has originated the reading ἑλληνιστάς, a reading that occurs in so many and such widely separated documents. Possible as all these explanations are, therefore, it must be confessed that the probability arising from transcriptional considerations is distinctly in favor of ἑλληνιστάς, the very difficulty of which is, in this aspect of it, its strongest recommendation.

Intrinsic Probability. — On the other hand, it must equally be confessed that the intrinsic evidence yields a strong probability for ἔλληνας. The very facts which transcriptionally suggest ἑλληνιστάς as the original reading throw the intrinsic probability in the other scale. Ἰουδαίους of v. 19 demands something other than Jews for its contrast. This demand is intensified by the καί before πρὸς ἑλλ., after which we apparently must inevitably expect some word denoting Gentiles. The further context only more and more adds to this expectation. The position of this paragraph (after xi. 1-18) would render such a solemn statement that the Greek-speaking Jews, as well as those who spoke Hebrew, were preached to in Antioch flat in the extreme, if not ridiculous. The contrast introduced by δέ (v. 20) lends its support in the same direction. The importance which was accorded in Jerusalem to the tidings of what had occurred at Antioch; the mission of Barnabas; his curious exhortation to the converts προσμένειν τῷ κυρίῳ, as if they specially needed such an encouragement; the still more curious explanation of how he came to give such a very obvious exhortation (in v. 24), as if, in this special case, it required great goodness and faith in him; Barnabas' call for aid to Saul, who had, as Barnabas knew, been set apart to preach to Gentiles; and, finally, the name of Christians given here first (v. 26) to the followers of Christ, and as a result of these labors, — a name which distinguished them from the Jews, and apparently marks the need of such distinction, — all these are but items of proof that Gentiles must be understood at v. 20. When we add that the next thing we hear of the Antiochian Church is that it is sending missions to the heathen (xiii.), and the next thing (xv.) that Judaizers from Jerusalem find it an uncircumcised body, the proof seems complete.

Nor do the efforts appear to us to have issued satisfactorily, which have been made to show that this apparent intrinsic necessity for a word in v. 20, which should express the notion of "Gentiles," is *prima facie* only. Some of the considerations which have been advanced with that end in view scarcely deserve refutation. Thus, when it is pleaded that the passage so read is inconsistent with the constant

representation of Cornelius as the first-fruits of the Gentiles, it is sufficient to ask why the events here described need be placed before his conversion. And when it is urged that the reception of so many Gentiles would have made more noise, judging by the commotion the case of Cornelius roused, it is sufficient to reply that the precedence of Cornelius' conversion is the sufficient account of this quiet, and to point to the opposition (xv.) which was finally developed. Other considerations, however, possess inherent force and demand respectful hearing. There are especially two of these: (1) Most defenders of Ἑλλημιστάς insist that the term Ἰουδαῖοι does not demand a sharper contrast than is furnished by it. Dr. Hort no doubt speaks extremely, and somewhat unguardedly, when he declares that the intrinsic evidence suggests Ἕλληνες "only if it be assumed that Ἰουδαῖοι is used in a uniformly exclusive sense throughout the book, whereas it excludes proselytes in ii. 10 and . . . xvii. 17 . . . and may, therefore, exclude Hellenists here." It is plain, on the contrary, that the contrasting word here must be something other than Jews in either blood or religion, in both of which particulars Hellenists were Jews. When the contrast is between modes of life only, it is expressed by Ἑβραίους and Ἑλλημιστάς. But some plausibility attaches to the statement that no sharp contrast is intended here at all; but what the passage is designed to teach is that, while all those who came to Antioch spoke to Jews only, the men of Cyprus and Cyrene devoted their labors especially to the Greek-speaking Jews, who were, perhaps, living more or less apart from their stricter brethren. Dr. Alexander, as well as Dr. Hort, urges this argument strongly. It cannot be considered, however, other than a *dernier resort*. The natural sense of the καί before πρὸς ἑλλ. (which, indeed, Dr. Alexander, in company with several others, *e.g.* Wordsworth, but without doubt wrongly, omits) is against it; as is also the whole implication of the context. Moreover, this theory may be said to be, if we may use the pointed words of Reuss,¹ "d'autant plus absurde, qu'à Antioche et dans les contrées environnantes on n'aura guère trouvé des Juifs parlant l'hébreu." (2) Again, it is frequently urged that Acts xiv. 27 is inconsistent with the assumption that Gentiles are meant in our present passage; for, "that God had *opened* the door of *faith* to the Gentiles," "would not have been news to them if they, who had been converted in large numbers at Antioch (v. 24), had been *Gentiles*." (Wordsworth.) We take it that it is this that Dr. Hort has in mind when he says, again somewhat extremely, that "if

¹ *Histoire Apostolique*, p. 133.

Gentiles, in the full sense, are the subjects of vv. 20-24 [of Chap. xi.], the subsequent conduct and language of St. Paul are not easy to explain," to which we may again oppose Reuss, who, on the other hand, asserts that, if Greek-speaking Jews be alone understood, "la conversion des païens disparaît ainsi du récit et tout ce qui suit n'a plus raison d'être."¹ The more moderate statement is itself fully met by calling attention to the immediate sequence of xv. 1 *sq.* to the words of Paul, which are thought to prove that the Antiochian Church was purely Jewish.

Accordingly, we feel driven to the conviction that the intrinsic evidence very strongly demands the sense of "Gentiles" in our passage. And this is the judgment of most expositors. Meyer, for example, declares that "it is *necessary*";² Alford, that "nothing to his mind is plainer," and these are but specimens of a very general judgment.

Thus, the question is of necessity forced upon us whether ἑλληνιστάς, which has been commended by external and paradiplomatic evidence alike as the probably original reading, can bear such a sense as will meet and satisfy the intrinsic demands of the passage. The word occurs so rarely that its usage cannot be adequately investigated. It occurs but twice elsewhere in the New Testament (Acts vi. 1 and ix. 29); and in both passages Jerusalem is the scene and Græcizing Jews, as distinguished from those who spoke Hebrew, seem to be denoted. It is, of course, impossible to frame any theory as to the general or even Lucan usage of the word on so narrow a basis. Outside the New Testament it is equally rare; its place being partly supplied by the participle of ἑλληνίζω (as, *e.g.*, in Aeschines c. Ctesip. 2³ and Athen. 6⁴). From what usage we have, however, from its derivation, and from its cognates, it is not impossible to obtain a generally accurate notion of its sense. One thing is clear: the narrowing of its concept to "Græcizing Jews" is entirely unjustified and utterly indefensible. The word naturally means "a Græcizer," and must obtain any narrower limitation from the context in which it is used. Although it might be possibly applied, as ἑλληνίζων is applied, in the passage just cited from Athen. 6, to Greeks who affected classicism,

¹ l. c.

² What is meant by the omission of this clause by Wendt, from the latest edition of Meyer's Acts, we cannot profess to know.

³ τὰ δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς μητρὸς, Σκύθης, βάρβαρος, ἑλληνίζων τῇ φωνῇ.

⁴ οἱ δ' ἑλληνίζοντες λέγειν δεῖν φασὶν ἀργυροῦν κόσμον καὶ χρυσοῦν κόσμον [instead of ἀργυρώματα or χρυσώματα].

its most natural and usual application would be to express the notion of Græcizing foreigners of whatever race. There can be small doubt but that an Athenian Greek would look upon the heathen masses at Antioch, and especially the mixed multitude which constituted the lower and artisan classes of that metropolis, no less than upon the Jews of Alexandria, as in the truest sense Hellenists.

Whether Luke could take the same view of the matter is not so clear. That he was of Gentile origin seems, indeed, certain. He would not, therefore, be expected to speak from the purely Jewish standpoint; when the contrast was a religious one, he might naturally adopt the Jewish speech; but when it was an ethnic one, such an adoption would be less natural. It is not impossible that he was an Antiochian, and it might be thought that this would render it unnatural for him to speak of his compatriots as Hellenists. It is necessary to remember, however, that the term was in no sense an objectionable one: "Hellenisten (Griechlinge) war der, übrigens durchaus nicht spottende, Übername, welcher von Seiten der Nationalgriechen solchen Fremden gegeben wurde, die in Sitten, Lebensverhältnissen, Sprache oder sonstwie dem Griechentume sich enger anschlossen" is probably as good a definition as could be framed for the word.¹ In such a Hellenistic age as that of which our history treats, and to which it belongs, the mere fact that men were designated as not of pure Greek origin had surely lost all sting. If, moreover, we assume that Luke was himself of Greek birth or descent,—either of which may be true,—the term loses all strangeness in his mouth.

More serious difficulties confront us when we leave the *à priori* ground and inquire after the standpoint of the Book of Acts itself. We find no difficulty in the fact that both at vi. 1 and ix. 29 Ἑλληνιστάς means Græcizing-Jews; for, that when speaking of Jerusalem the Hellenists are Græcizing-Jews is natural, and offers no presumption against the use of the same word to express Græcizing-Syrians when Antioch is spoken of. Nor do we find difficulty in the fact that Antioch was in a sense a Greek city, and is spoken of as such, *e.g.*, in II. Macc. iv. 10, 15. The contrast in that passage is between Jew and foreigner, and consequently we find in v. 13 Ἑλληνισμός and ἁλλοφυλισμός used as convertible terms; and the whole passage is conceived and written from an intensely Jewish view-point. It can scarcely be seriously maintained that the mass of the Antiochians were other than Hellenizers, and might be correctly and naturally described under that term by any one writing out of a less strongly Jewish feeling. Even

¹ Reuss in Herzog's R. E. ed. 2, sub.-voc.

in the mouth of a Jew the word "Greek" had two senses, in one of which it was a national term, the opposite of "barbarian" (Rom. i. 14), and in the other a quasi-religious one, the opposite of "Jew" (Rom. i. 16). In the former sense it excluded Hellenists; in the latter, it included all Hellenists of other than Jewish blood and faith. From the strongly Jewish standpoint of II. Macc. it was inevitable that Antioch should be thought of and called Greek or Heathen; from the liberal standpoint of Luke, himself a Gentile, and perhaps even a Greek in the narrower sense, the same city might rather seem Hellenistic. It is, therefore, of much greater importance to note Luke's own use of the term Ἑλλην. It lies on the face of things that he not only speaks of the Corinthians (xviii. 4) and Amphipolitans (xvii. 4) and Asians (xix. 10) as Greeks, but also of the Gentiles that lived in Iconium (xiv. 1), and Timothy's father at Lystra (xvi. 1, 3). It also lies on the face of things that the standing opposite to Ἰουδαίους in Acts is Ἑλλήνας, not Ἑλληνιστάς. Luke thus apparently adopts the Jewish standpoint, and speaks from that point of view. Presumptions thus arise against his calling the Antiochian heathen, Hellenists, rather than Greeks or Gentiles; and against his opposing to Ἰουδαίους other than its usual and accurate opposite Ἕλληνας or ἔθνη (xiv. 5). These presumptions are still further increased by the fact that Ἑλληνιστάς and Ἰουδαίους are not in any event mutually exclusive; Ἑλληνιστάς in the sense of "Greek-speaking Jews" is but a part of Ἰουδαίους, and the Ἰουδαῖοι of Antioch were but a part of the Ἑλληνισταὶ understood in the broad sense of "Græcizers." The weight of these presumptions is certainly very great, but hardly great enough to render it impossible to suppose that Luke has used Ἑλληνιστάς here to express the population of Antioch in general. Paul, a Jew, could desert his usual Jewish standpoint and usual contrast of "Greeks and Jews" just once for the more Greek view-point and expression of "Greeks and barbarians" (Rom. i. 14); and there is no reason why Luke, a Gentile himself, may not similarly have deserted just once the Jewish standpoint, and have written "Jews and Græcizers" rather than "Jews and Greeks." And it needs to be observed, also, that, however true it may be that "Jews and Hellenists" do not constitute an exclusive and clear partition, generally speaking, it is sharply enough drawn for the needs of our present passage, and suffices for the progress of thought there indicated. The advance from the narrower word to the broader, from which the narrower by the very contrast is excluded, secures the progress demanded by the context. "Some preached to the Jews only, but some preached also to the Hellenistic population in general."

This last remark anticipates somewhat the discussion of the fitness of this understanding of the term to the immediate context. It cannot be denied that it has a somewhat strange appearance there. The inexactness of its contrast to Ἰουδαίους is disturbing, especially after force has been thrown upon the contrast by the καί. That the demands of the contextual flow of thought are preserved, however, has been already pointed out; and the strangeness of the word here to us may result from the rarity of it in general. If it were an ordinary term in the common speech of the day to describe the population of the Hellenizing cities, it would become very natural in this context. Difficult, then, as it confessedly is to take it here in the sense of the Antiochians in general, it is scarcely impossible; and thus there emerges at least one way in which the conflict between the intrinsic evidence and the other forms of testimony can be voided.

The Conclusion.

In attempting to combine the various elements of this evidence and reach a conclusion, four courses are open to us:—

(1) We may follow the external and transcriptional evidence to the neglect of the intrinsic, and read Ἑλληνοιστάς in the sense of "Greek-speaking Jews."

(2) We may follow the intrinsic evidence to the neglect of the external and transcriptional, and read Ἕλληνας.

(3) We may follow the external evidence as valid for the transmitted text, and then assume, on the basis of the intrinsic evidence, a "primitive error," arising probably from the proximity of εὐαγγελιζόμενοι, and so venture to restore Ἕλληνας by critical conjecture.

(4) We may harmonize the external and transcriptional evidence on the one side with the intrinsic evidence on the other by reading Ἑλληνοιστάς, and understanding it in the broad sense of "Græcizers," meaning thereby the total mixed population of Antioch.

No one of these courses is free from grave difficulty. To the present writer the *first* appears almost, if not quite, impossible; it does absolute violence to every exegetical hint a context could well give. And however true it may be, as Dr. Hort says, that "the difficulty probably arises from the brevity of the record and the slightness of our knowledge," it remains equally true that, in the present state of our knowledge, it is impossible to do such violence to contextual indications. The *third method*, again, can be but the resort of desperation, and cannot be adopted so long as any loophole of escape is open to us. Conjectural emendation is, no doubt, a proper

enough method of castigating the text ; but every resort to it, and every use of it, in cases where intrinsic evidence and transcriptional evidence do not unite to compel the resort and suggest the remedy, is not only precarious but unjustifiable. Drs. Howson and Spence¹ well remark that the remedy offered by the *second method* is very suspiciously easy. It is a dangerous expedient to adopt the easiest reading in such cases as this, especially when it is done in the face of apparently decisive external testimony. It cannot be too strenuously emphasized that divided internal evidence is suspicious.² To venture to cast aside, on intrinsic grounds alone, the combined external and transcriptional probabilities, differs in little but the name from the most uncertain kind of conjectural emendation. Nevertheless, if any of the first three methods are to be adopted, it must be this ; although it is essentially the acceptance of an impure conjecture of a tolerably precarious kind. No doubt other cases may be pointed out where an equal array of external witnesses is confessedly overborne by the weight of internal considerations ; the difficulty here lies in the division of the internal evidence itself. If we can persuade ourselves that the transcriptional evidence is also in favor of Ἑλλῆνας, our procedure will become easy and certain. Then, it will be plain that the stem of descent became corrupt after the divergence of the Western class, and before the separation of the Neutral and Alexandrian. This occurs actually in other cases, and is theoretically conceivable. But in the present case the transcriptional evidence apparently stubbornly arrays itself on the wrong side to allow this supposition. According as we consider the transcriptional evidence here to be strongly for, faintly for, or possibly against Ἑλληνοιστάς, ought we to judge this second method of procedure to be impossible, improbable, or probable. The difficulties that lie against the *fourth method* have been already sufficiently adverted to and are obvious of themselves. The fact that it alone harmonizes the various kinds of evidence is much in its favor. It is possible that it has the support of the Greek commentators, from Chrysostom to Theophylact, who apparently read Ἑλληνοιστάς in their text, and without any hesitation explain it of the Gentiles. It may account for the carelessness of the versions in not seeking discriminating equivalents for Ἕλληνες and Ἑλληνοισταί, in which they may be simply a reflection of the usage of their day. It is still

¹ Schaff's *Popular Commentary on the New Testament*, in loco.

² Compare the brief and pertinent remarks in Wescott and Hort's *Greek Testament*, vol. i., p. 542, and the corresponding passage of vol. ii., in §§ 32-37.

further supported by the failure of the fathers to preserve a distinction between the words. Our choice must certainly lie between this method and the second, and beset with difficulty as it is, this fourth method appears to the present writer, on the whole, the easier solution. We propose, therefore, the provisional adoption of the reading [Ἑλλημιστάς] — enclosed in square brackets — with the reading Ἑλληνας on the margin, and the understanding that it stands there as a true gloss as well as less well-authenticated various reading. It may not be impossible that some such process may go on in our minds in this case as that which Dr. Vaughan describes in the preface to the third edition of his *Commentary on Romans*: “It is deeply interesting,” he says, “to take note of the process of thought and feeling which attends in one’s own mind the presentation of some unfamiliar reading. At first sight the suggestion is repelled as unintelligible, startling, almost shocking. By degrees light dawns upon it; it finds its plea and its palliation. At last, in many instances, it is accepted as adding force and beauty to the context, and a conviction gradually forms itself that thus, and not otherwise, was it written.”¹ The same process may attend the consideration of a new understanding of an old reading.

¹ 5th ed., London, 1880, p. xxi. Cf. also *Authorized or Revised? Sermons*, etc., London, 1882, p. xii.

Ænon near to Salim.

BY PROF. WM. ARNOLD STEVENS.

THERE is perhaps no lost Biblical site, unless it be "Bethany beyond Jordan," that the student of the Gospel narrative is now so eager to recover, as the Ænon of John iii. 23. Here John the Baptist appears for the last time on the public arena of history. Here he delivers his last recorded testimony to the Messiah, unsurpassed in moral sublimity by any utterance that has since fallen from human lips. Neither Ænon nor Salim occurs elsewhere in the New Testament; whether either is mentioned in the Old Testament remains to be ascertained. Both names have wandered like disembodied spirits in search of their proper habitat. They have traversed Palestine from south to north, on both sides of the Jordan, and sometimes have settled down in very "dry places."

That the Greek *Αἰνών* represents an Aramaic derivative of 'Ain, "spring," either an intensive or a plural (see Grimm, *Clavis N. T.*), is scarcely to be questioned. It is therefore a descriptive local name, equivalent to "the Springs." So J. Lightfoot: "I should rather take Ænon for the name of some large and spacious compass of ground, full of fresh springs and waters, than for any one particular town, river, or city" (see *Harmony of the Four Evangelists*, on John iii. 23). Its situation is only defined as that of the well-known, or at least the better known, Salim. The latter name, it is to be noted, is an unexplained exception to current Greek usage as to names of towns; it is not feminine (though so given in Robinson's *Lexicon*; in Grimm's *Clavis* the question of gender remains unnoticed), but either masculine or neuter.

The writer has been led, while treating of the life of Christ, in the classroom, to a frequent examination of the arguments *pro* and *con* for each of the proposed sites. From data supplied by the Gospel narrative itself, he had been inclined to seek the locality in central rather than southern Palestine, and that, either in the valley of the Jordan, south of Beisân, or, following Robinson, in the neighborhood of Sâlim, east of Nâblous. A three or four months' tour in Palestine,

early in 1883, afforded an opportunity to visit the Ghôr at Beisân, as well as the tract lying north and east of Nâblous. The result of a personal examination of the ground was to convince him of the general correctness of Robinson's identification (adopted also by Capt. Conder) as against any other of the numerous proposed sites. Capt. Conder attempts no definite localization, but seems inclined to place Ænon as near Khûrbet 'Ainûn as the course of the Fâr'ah stream will allow. It is perhaps possible to determine the site still more precisely. The object of this paper is in part to advocate Robinson's view, and also to direct special attention to the western end of the Wâdy Beidân, three or four miles north of Sâlim, as the probable site of the New Testament Ænon. First a glance at

Leading Opinions Hitherto.

1. *In the Ghôr, South of Beisân.* — Fourth century tradition placed both Ænon and Salim eight Roman miles to the south of Scythopolis, and not far from the Jordan ("juxta Jordanem"). See Jerome (*Onomasticon*, articles *Ænon* and *Salim*). The latter was still pointed out, a village called Salumias. Jerome, in opposition to the then prevailing view, also considered this to have been the royal residence of Melchizedek. Epiphanius considered it to have been the Salem near Shechem.¹

Drs. Robinson and Smith, who together explored that part of the Ghôr in 1852, found no trace of ruins, or of either name except the Wely oî shrine of a Sheikh Sâlim at the foot of Tell Ridghah, less than two miles from the stream of the Jordan. The industrious

¹ "Ænon juxta Salim, ubi baptizabat Joannes, sicut in Evangelio cata Joannem scriptum est (iii. 23): et ostenditur nunc usque locus in octavo lapide Scythopoleos ad meridiem juxta Salim et Jordanem" (Jerome, *Migne Patrol. Lat.*, vol. 23, tom. iii. 163).

"Sichem et Salem, quæ (Latine et Græce) Sicima vocata est, civitas Jacob, nunc deserta. Ostenditur autem locus in suburbanis Neapoleos juxta sepulcrum Joseph," etc. (*ibid.*, 266).

"Salem, civitas Sicimorum, quæ est Sichem; sed et alia villa ostenditur usque in præsentem diem (juxta Æliam contra occidentalem plagam hoc nomine; in octavo quoque lapide a Scythopoli in campo vicus Salumias appellatur; Josephus vero Salem esse affirmat in qua regnavit Melchisedec, quæ postea dicta est Solyma, et ad extremum, Hierosolymæ nomen accepit" (*ibid.*, 267).

"... Oppidum juxta Scythopolim, quod usque hodie appellatur Salem, et ostenditur ibi palatium Melchisedec, ex magnitudine ruinarum veteris operis ostendens magnificentiam" (*ibid.*, vol. 22, tom. i. 445).

(See also Reland, *Palestina*, p. 721.)

inquiries of Tyrwhitt Drake and Capt. Conder were equally unsatisfactory. See report of Drake (*P. E. F. Quarterly*, 1875, p. 32): "Ænon and Salim have been identified by Van de Velde as Bir Sâlim and Sheikh Sâlim. Inquiries of the Arabs and the Fellahin in the above district resulted in not a man of them ever having heard of either of the places."

Among the moderns who more or less confidently adopt this site are Van de Velde, Greswell, Andrews (*Life of Our Lord*), Edersheim (*Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, i. 393), Pressel (in Herzog's *Encyclopädie*, art. "Salim"; also Güder, art. "Johannes der Täufer"), Caspari (*Chronologisch-geog. Einleitung*, § 87), Ellicott (*Life of Christ*, p. 126, note, Amer. ed.), Grove (Smith's *Dict. of the Bible*, art. "Salim"), Hackett (*ibid.*, Amer. ed., art. "Ænon").

Eusebius and Jerome appear simply to have reported current tradition, and, as the citations in the accompanying note show, unlinked with any confirmatory historical facts. It is a manifest objection to the correctness of the tradition, that it places Ænon so near to the Jordan. The site identified by Van de Velde as Salim is but a little over a mile from the river, and the springs of the proposed Ænon not much farther. Now a spot within two or three miles at most from the river Jordan would scarcely call for special description as a place of "much water," this fact being evidently inserted by the evangelist to designate it as an appropriate locality for the administration of baptism. Considering that the Jordan valley had been the scene of the Baptist's public ministry for a year or more, the annexed reason for the choice of Ænon at the time seems plainly to indicate that it was *not* in the Jordan valley, at least in close proximity to the river itself. To add "for there was much water there" were quite superfluous, if John was still within a few minutes' walk of the river.

2. The majority of modern expositors take us to *Southern Judea*, chiefly supporting their opinion by the similarity of the two names with the *Ain* and *Shilhim* of Josh. xv. 32: **ושלחם ועין**. In Josh. xix. 7 *Ain* again occurs. The *En*- of *En-Rimmon*, in Neh. xi. 29, is supposed to be the same. (See Wieseler *Chron. Synopse der vier Evn.*, p. 247.) It is also urged: "The Evangelist indicates plainly enough that his Ænon is to be looked for in Judea; for, after having said (iii. 22) that Jesus and his disciples had baptized in the land of Judea (ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ γῇ), he immediately proceeds ἦν δὲ καὶ Ἰωάννης βαπτίζων ἐν Αἰνὼν ἐγγὺς τοῦ Σαλείμ. Now it is certainly most natural to refer the comparison, here indicated by καί, not merely to the act of baptizing, but of baptizing in the land of Judea; there was no need of

this clause to inform us that John baptized." (*Ibid.*, Eng. Tr., p. 245.) So Meyer, briefly, that Ænon "in Judæa, nicht in Samarien, gelegen haben muss." But this is to pervert entirely the writer's *καί* in iii. 23. It is intended to indicate, not identity of locality, but the simultaneousness of these two ministries at this junction of the Gospel history. John was still engaged in baptizing,—this being still further explained in verse 24,—"for John was not yet cast into prison." The tenor of the passage is rather to distinguish the two locations apart than to identify the latter as belonging to the same region. Among those who adopt the above identification are Alford, Godet, Pressensé (*Jesus Christ*, Eng. Tr., p. 227; in his note he favors an etymology which he is scarcely justifiable in attributing to Wieseler, namely, that Ænon is a contraction (!) from En-Rimmon), Milligan and Moulton (*Popular Commentary on the N. T.*; the parenthetical statement that Shilhim of Josh. xv. 32 is "translated Salem in the LXX," gives an incorrect impression of the fact).

The resemblance of a שִׁלְחִים (Shilchîm; in codex Alex. of the LXX Σελεείμ), with an *Ain* near it, to the Σαλείμ of the text, is but a slender support for this view.¹ Against it is the drift of the Evangelist's narrative (according to the interpretation given above), the absence of historical or geographical data to establish it, and, finally, the absence of an abundance of water in any site to which the names given in Joshua can probably be assigned.

3. *East of the Jordan.*—This embraces a third class of conjectures. Dr. Lightfoot was at first inclined to locate Ænon in Galilee (see *Harmony of the Gospels*, part iii., published in 1650), but in his *Chorographical Inquiry*, dated 1671, he withdrew that opinion, and favored the hypothesis of an Ænon in Southern Peræa, believing that "we must look for it either in Galilee or Peræa," for the reason that it was about this time that John was seized by Herod, and that he must, accordingly, have been baptizing at some point within Herod's dominions. The erudite Lampe argues at length to the same effect, that the scene of John's closing ministry was, in all probability, not remote from the Peræan capital of Herod Antipas, the city Julias, or from Machærus, the fortress of John's captivity.

Among recent writers, Edersheim is disposed to entertain favorably the view "that Ænon, near Salim, was actually within the dominions

¹ Wieseler considers Αἰνών in Josh. xv. 61 (according to the codex Vat. μαδων) to be the same place as the Αἶν in v. 32 (codex Alex.). It is difficult to see on what ground this assumption rests.

of Herod," and, "in that case, may even have been in Peræa itself" (*Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, i., p. 657).

But against this hypothesis the words addressed to John by his disciples seem decisive: "he that was with thee beyond Jordan," etc. (John iii. 26). For, although the phrase "beyond Jordan" is certainly not to be taken in every case as denoting *east of* the river, it can scarcely be otherwise understood in the present instance. The *first* scene of the Baptist's activity, as described in the fourth Gospel, is "Bethany beyond Jordan" (i. 28). In describing the transactions of scene *second*, it is inconceivable that the writer should have used the phrase "beyond Jordan" in a reverse and a rare sense, and without a glimpse of a reason for so doing.

4. 'Ain Fârah (or 'Ain Wâdy Fârah) near Jerusalem. — This identification of Ænon, by Dr. Barclay, with one of the headsprings of the Wâdy Kelt, would scarcely detain us, except for its adoption by Mr. Trelawney Saunders, who has confidently inserted it in his New Testament Map of Western Palestine, recently constructed from the plates of the Palestine Exploration Fund. The following is the description of the spring as given in the *P. E. F. Memoirs*, vol. iii., p. 170: "'Ain Fârah is a very fine spring, surrounded with a thick growth of reeds and oleander bushes. Small fish have been found in the water." It is interesting to compare with this the glowing description and the illustrative wood-cut in Dr. Barclay's *City of the Great King* (see pp. 558-569). It lies equally distant from 'Anâta (Anathoth) and Jeba (Geba), about three and one-half miles to the east, in the bed of a precipitous ravine. I was not myself fortunate enough to see the spring, though on two different occasions, while exploring the routes from Jericho to Bethel and Ai, I was a mile or two above the spot, among the steep gorges that converge towards it; and again, several miles below it, I climbed down into the bed of the wâdy, to which, for a part of the year, it furnishes a visible stream.¹

The chief argument for the identification is the name Suleim, belonging to a small wâdy south of Anathoth. This similarity of name, and the existence of a copious spring in the neighborhood, constitute an argument certainly entitled to a hearing, but hardly sufficient to offset two historical improbabilities: first, that the Baptist should have

¹ The volume of water is not sufficient to supply the channel below throughout the year. If the reader will take the trouble to consult the large map of the Pal. Ex. Fund, he will see that the permanent stream of the Wâdy Kelt does not begin at 'Ain Fârah, but several miles lower down, at 'Ain el Kelt.

been prosecuting his mission at this late period so near Jerusalem, the central seat of the opposition on the part of the Pharisees and the hierarchy; second, that he should have chosen this sterile tract, amid a tangle of precipitous ravines, as a suitable place for a multitude to gather about him and receive baptism.

It is perhaps needless to add to the preceding Sepp's conjecture of Beit 'Ainûn, near Hebron (see his chapter on "Der Täufer at Ænon," *Leben Jesu Christi*); Lightfoot's, referred to above, that Salim lay in Galilee, in the territory of Issachar; and others. Dr. Thomson, in his recent *Central Palestine and Phœnicia*, remarks, p. 153: "Both Ænon and Salim, therefore, must be classed with Biblical sites not yet identified."

5. *Near Sâlim, east of Nâblous.* — Robinson was the first to identify this village with the Σαλείμ of John's Gospel (*Researches*, iii. 333), leaving the suggestion, however, as a mere hypothesis, from the absence of sufficiently confirmatory data. He remarks upon the ruin 'Ainûn, which he had visited, situated on a small tell, about seven miles north-east of Sâlim, but finding "no Salim near, nor a drop of water," passes it by without pausing to account for this capital specimen of *lucus a non*; evidently, he attached but little importance to the name for the purpose of fixing more precisely the site for which he was seeking. Sâlim lies on the southern slope of the mountain Neby Belân, about four miles from Nâblous, and two and one-half miles due east from Jacob's Well. "It is a small village resembling the rest, but evidently ancient, having rock-cut tombs, cisterns, and a tank. Olive trees surround it; on the north are two springs, about three-quarters of a mile from the village" (*P. E. F. Memoirs*, vol. ii., p. 230). "In the Samaritan Chronicle it is called Salem the Great, and the Samaritans understand it to be mentioned in Gen. xxxiii. 18. Sâlim is also possibly the Caphar Salama of I. Macc. vii. 31, which seems to have been in Samaria" (*ibid.*).

Robinson's identification of this Sâlim with that of John iii. 23 has been adopted by many recent authorities. See Conder's *Tent Work in Palestine*, chap. iii., also the *Memoirs*, cited above, and *Hand-book of the Bible*, p. 320; Rowland (art. "Salim," *Imperial Bible Dict.*); Porter (in Murray's *Handbook for Syria and Palestine*); Major Wilson (*Bible Educator*, vol. iv., p. 121).

As to Ænon, Conder seems disposed to locate it as near as possible to Khurbet 'Ainûn, but is content to leave it somewhere in the broad open valley of the upper Fâr'ah, between Salim and 'Ainûn. Porter (*Hand-book*, p. 340) places it on the northern fork of the Fâr'ah at or

near Burj Fâr'ah. McGarvey (*Lands of the Bible*, p. 293) found to his view a still more suitable location about four miles below the junction of the two branches of the stream.

Wâdy Beidân.

The Fâr'ah is the principal western affluent of the Jordan. It is a narrow, deep valley, flanked by parallel mountain ranges, running at first due south-east, then more to the south, till it reaches the Ghôr. The distance from the northern headsprings at Burj Fâr'ah to the Jordan, following the general line of its course, is about twenty miles. The stream itself is a slender thread banked by bluffs, steep, but grassy and not precipitous; at several points I judged them one hundred feet high or more. Above them the valley expands to the width of from one to two miles. The opposite ridges of the two mountain ranges are stated by Conder to be about four miles apart. In this extensive tract, though fertile and well watered, there is not a single village. It is held by the Mesa'ayd, a tribe of nomadic Arabs. They numbered in 1874, according to the report of Tyrwhitt Drake, one hundred and ten tents, and one hundred and eighty men.

In Biblical history this valley is known only as a thoroughfare. "It was up this valley that Jacob drove his flocks and herds from Succoth to Shalem near Shechem. It was along the banks of its stream that the 'garments and vessels' of the hosts of Benhadad were strewn as far as Jordan" (Conder, *Tent Work*, i. 91).

The situation and course of the Wâdy Beidân, which forms the southern branch of the Fâr'ah, will be seen by a glance at the large map of the Palestine Exploration Fund. At its beginning, it is a deep slit in the limestone strata between Ebal and Neby Belân; in the rainy season it drains the plain between Jacob's Well and Sâlim, but most of the year is a dry gully. Starting from the springs called Râs el Fâr'ah, it is about two miles in length, running almost due east till it joins the northern branch of the Fâr'ah. The writer's entrance into the valley was from the village of 'Askar, where he had encamped the previous day, April 20. The path follows nearly the ancient road to Damascus, *via* Scythopolis and Gadara. It skirts the base of Mt. Ebal, a little above the level of the plain of Sâlim, and, in the course of half an hour's riding, descends rapidly alongside of the gully. Our guide, a man from 'Askar, called the gully Wâdy Ibrîd. It is the southernmost branchlet, referred to above, of the Wâdy Beidân, which latter name the men of whom we made inquiry applied only to the lower portion, where the water supply is perennial. The hills on either side

as we descend are treeless ; scarcely a shrub is seen for half an hour, except a few rows of olives on our right across the gorge. The path is deeply worn into the white marl, and worms its way among the softer portions in so crooked a fashion as to make rapid riding an impossibility. The gorge narrows and deepens ; the steep mountain wall on the right is Neby Belân, rising to the height of nearly two thousand feet above us. Between the path and Neby Belân is the deeply cut torrent-bed down among the rocks, edged on the side next to us with uptilted strata of dark, nummulitic limestone, shooting up from the gorge in strikingly picturesque serrated masses. The whole pass must always have formed a magnificent natural gateway to Shechem from the east.

In less than an hour after leaving 'Ain 'Askar we are at 'Ain es Subiân, the southernmost of the large springs that feed the Fâr'ah. Turning now a little to the left, in a few minutes more we descend abruptly into another ravine, at the foot of the Mt. Ebal group. Here we are at the proper beginning of the Wâdy Beidân, — the Râs el Fâr'ah springs, which feed with perennial abundance the southern fork of the Fâr'ah stream. Fountains are bursting forth from the rocks on either side, and a mountain brook is plunging downward in cascades and broken streams to the lower bed of the Wady. The road, instead of following the water-course, crosses it, and, continuing northward to Tûbâs, traverses the triangular terrace which separates the two branches of the Fâr'ah.

This rocky glen of fountains may well detain the traveller a moment. Within the space of half a mile are numberless springs ; the names of several of the larger are given on the Survey map. No other spot in Palestine, south of the sources of the Jordan at Bânias or Tell el Kâdy, so well deserves the name of "The Springs." There are four overshot flour mills within a few rods of one another ; lower down, in the course of two miles, are six or seven others. Some of the latter bring their water through aqueducts of solid masonry, others by a mill-race carried down to the terminus of the Wady. Other little canals are drawn off on either side for the purposes of irrigation. The rich green of grass, planted grain, and dense shrubbery, offers to the eye a most refreshing contrast with the sterile chalk and limestone slopes we have just traversed. One of the largest of the mills is at the inflow of the little rivulet from 'Ain es Subiân. From this point the Wâdy Beidân extends for nearly two miles to its junction with the Fâr'ah ; in places it is from a quarter to half a mile in width, enclosed between the higher terraces of the valley, and lying about two thousand feet below the

adjoining Neby Belân. The traveller will find few spots in Syria so beautiful as this glen in the wild luxuriance of its tropical foliage. Some gardens and enclosures of cultivated trees are owned, we were told, in Nâblous and Tulluza, as are also the neighboring mills. At the water's edge were thickets of oleander, then in full bloom; within enclosures were the walnut, mulberry, olive, fig, and in great abundance that most beautiful tree of the orient, the pomegranate, just blossoming into gorgeous crimson.

The stream is swift, winding little, but broadens here and there into pools of considerable depth. The men at the mills said large fish were caught in them, and sold in the market at Nâblous; I saw none longer than seven or eight inches. Of the depth of the water I attempted only an approximate measurement, by hiring one of the Fellâhin, who was fishing, to go with us, and wade back and forth through the pools. The largest was near the upper end of the glen, and in this the water reached about to his armpits. As compared with the northern branch of the Fâr'ah stream, this branch appears to be considerably the larger; the volume of water at the junction was evidently much greater. With this opinion accords the fact that the natives have given the name Râs el Fâr'ah (head of the Fâr'ah) to the southern group of springs.

Proofs of the Identification.

Near the Western End of the Wâdy Beidân.—In favor of thus locating Ænon upon the future New Testament Maps of Palestine are the following considerations: they apply for the most part to any site in the upper Fâr'ah, but become still more significant and conclusive, assuming the definite locality that has just been described.

1. *It is ἐγγὺς τοῦ Σαλέμ.*—Now it must be admitted that we cannot yet identify this Salim with certainty; but recent geography and early tradition are at one, at least so far as to look for it in or on the border of Samaria. If the Shalem of Gen. xxxiii. 18 be the name of a city, it is then by all means probable that John refers to that ancient and well-known Biblical site. Granting it is not, but merely an adjective, "safe," still the Septuagint is in evidence that there was a Salem (Σαλήμ) here in the neighborhood of Shechem; and that to the Evangelist and his readers, familiar as they were with that version, it was known as the city by which Jacob encamped on his arrival from Padan Aram.

The objection perhaps occurs to the reader: if Ænon was situated in the valley so near the famous Samaritan capital, why

should the Evangelist not describe its situation accordingly? Why is it not "near to Shechem," the better-known city, instead of "near to Salim," especially considering that he wrote at a distance from Palestine, and for readers, to a great extent, unfamiliar with its geography? The answer that at once suggests itself is that the latter may have been its usual designation in Palestine itself, where it was to be distinguished from other Ænons. Furthermore, the Wâdy Beidân is, as described above, the natural appendage to the plain which is still often called the "plain of Salim,"¹ whereas it is some five miles in a direct line from Nâblous, and to the traveller much further, because he must follow the road around Mt. Ebal.

That the Sâlim east of Nâblous has had a continuous existence from the New Testament period seems still more likely from the fact that the Samaritan Chronicle, in its list of twenty-two towns, where the high priests who succeeded Tōbiah resided, mentions, first in order, *Salem* (in the Arabic version, *Salim*) *the Great* (Neubauer's Sam. Chron., cited by Conder, Pal. Ex. Fund *Special Papers*, p. 230). It was probably, therefore, the chief and well-known place of that name at the time of John's writing.

2. No one spot in all western Palestine that could possibly be named as the site of Ænon is so well entitled to be designated "The Springs." The Wâdy Beidân is emphatically a place of "much water" (πολλὰ ὕδατα). Its closely-clustered group of springs would give the name to the valley, not merely from the ample supply of

¹ May this not furnish the clue to the gender of Σαλείμ? The permanence of the name renders it more than probable that the northern end of the plain or valley, often called the Mūkhna, anciently bore the name of the town overlooking it; ὁ Σαλείμ may have come to be the name of the plain (as ὁ Σάρον, of the plain of Sharon), it being a tract then threaded and crossed by several of the most important roads in Palestine.

Or the article may be neuter, the name belonging, at a still earlier date, to the mountain. Every traveller who has approached Nâblous from the north-east, south, or east, will recall the white wely of Neby Belân as the most conspicuous land-mark of the region. It crests the mountain-peak, on the southern slope of which lies the village of Sâlim. It is the local shrine, as I found on inquiry, to which the inhabitants of Sâlim and the two adjacent villages most frequently resort. One can hardly doubt that it is one of the Palestinian "high places" of very ancient sanctity, and it may itself have borne the name Σαλείμ. In that case, whether itself anterior to the town-name or not, the name might well have been τὸ Σαλείμ. On this latter supposition it would be still more natural for an Ænon situated in the Wâdy Beidân to be described as "near to Salim," since one who is in the valley seems to see the summits of the mountain almost immediately above him.

water for use, but as a conspicuous feature of the landscape. The traveller in ancient times as now must have taken with him a vivid picture of the verdant foliage and white cascades seen below him in the rocky gorge.

3. *Proximity of the name 'Ainûn.* — This is a ruined village, “apparently modern, standing on a small hillock” (see *P. E. F. Memoirs*, vol. ii., p. 234). It is described by Robinson, and also by Guérin. The site is about five miles north-east of the springs of the Beidân. “There is only one other place of the name in Palestine,” says Conder (*Tent Work*, i., p. 92), “Beit 'Ainûn, near Hebron; but this is a place which has no very fine supply of water, and no Salem near it. On the other hand, there are many other Salems all over Palestine, but none of them have an Ænon near them.” It must be conceded that the finding of comparatively modern village-ruins with the name 'Ainûn, on a site so destitute of water as quite to belie the name, besides being distant some seven miles from Sâlim, over two intervening mountain-ranges, is not at first sight a promising re-enforcement to the argument. But the mere existence of this name in the region of the ancient Salim is a fact not to be ignored. Further, the very fact of its inappropriateness on its present site suggests the conjecture that it is a comparatively modern transfer from some earlier site in the neighborhood, nearer to the springs in the bed of the Fâr'ah. Such a transfer of an ancient name to a neighboring site (compare, for instance, the modern Sûrafend, the ancient Sarepta, or Zarephath) is sufficiently common to make it a creditable supposition in the present case.

4. *It fully satisfies the conditions imposed by the gospel narrative.* — John's work was nearly ended; our Lord had not yet left Judea to enter upon his ministry in Galilee. For not far from a year and a half John had been fulfilling his mission, — first in the lower Jordan valley, afterwards moving to the north. Between himself and the Jewish authorities at Jerusalem, the relation was one of recognized and avowed hostility. That the latter exerted themselves to diminish his influence and to hinder his public ministry, we can hardly doubt. It was but natural for John to withdraw from the region of Jerusalem and the districts most accessible to Pharasaic and priestly influence. The Wâdy Beidân, at the head of the Fâr'ah valley, was quite suitable for his purpose. Here was water for baptizing; space and water for the numbers who gathered about him, though at this period there were probably no such immense multitudes as at first. Two great thoroughfares converged just at the head of the valley, — that from Damascus

and the north, leading into central and southern Palestine, and that from Peræa and the Jordan valley. Other roads came in from the west, at Shechem. Thus, the site was public and accessible.

Another point is to be considered. The forerunner may have wished to avoid molestation on the part of Herod Antipas as well as from the Jewish hierarchy. Whether he had already aroused the Tetrarch's hostility by rebuking his connection with Herodias, we cannot certainly know; but it is not improbable. It is plain, however, from Josephus, whose account rather supplements than contradicts the gospel history, that Herod had long been disturbed by the popular uprising caused by the preaching of John; this fact of itself would incline the Baptist to select a situation for this stage of his work outside of Herod's dominions.

"But it is difficult to believe," Dr. Andrews objects (in his invaluable *Life of Our Lord*, p. 156), "that John, the preacher of the Law, could have entered Samaria to baptize, when, at a later period, the Lord forbade the Twelve to preach in any of its cities (Matt. x. 5)."

Similarly Godet asks: "How should John have settled among the Samaritans? How would the multitude have followed him to the midst of this hostile people?" Weiss asserts positively: "It is in the nature of the case impossible that he had taken up his station in Samaria" (*Leben Jesu*, vol. ii., p. 408, note).¹

But, we ask, why should John abstain from occupying a Samaritan neighborhood? Known to the Samaritans to be under ban of the Jewish hierarchy, he would be all the more welcome. He was not so much the preacher of the Law, as the herald of the Messiah; and the Samaritans, too, were awaiting a Messiah. Again, that John was stationed within the Samaritan limits does not imply that he came with a special mission to the Samaritans. It is not as if he entered a Samari-

¹ I give the note in full. It illustrates, particularly the last remark, which I have put in italics, a tendency on the part of the distinguished author (it would be easy to add other examples) to neglect facts of geography and objective history that one would suppose easily accessible to him.

"Das Joh. iii. 23 genannte Ænon bei Salem, wo er taufte, ist uns gänzlich unbekannt; aber die Angaben der Kirchenväter weisen hoch in den Norden hinauf.

"Die gangbare Vorstellung, dass auch Johannes noch in Judäa wirkte, ist nach den Andeutungen unseres Evangelisten ganz unwahrscheinlich; dass er in Samaria seinen Standort nahm, ist von vorn herein unmöglich; so bleibt nur das galiläische oder peräische Gebiet übrig. Uebrigens schliesst die Bemerkung, dass der Ort wasserreich war, keineswegs aus, dass derselbe im Jordantal lag, da der Jordan schwerlich überall tief genug war, um darin zu taufen."

tan community. To cross the vaguely-drawn boundary of Samaria involved no trespass or assumption of privilege, as would be the case in entering a territory of a European state or province. Particularly in the case of this ill-defined province, with its mixture of races, we are not to suppose that the Samaritans either actually occupied, or had jurisdiction over all the tracts between their towns. In ancient or in modern Palestine there was a constant interpenetration and intermingling of populations within very limited districts. An open-air encampment of a Jewish prophet for preaching and baptizing at the head of the Fâr'ah valley, might be *in Samaria* without trespassing upon a Samaritan community, or breaking down in any way the barrier between the two peoples. Our Lord, indeed, forbade the Twelve, at the time when he sent them forth during the imprisonment of John the Baptist, to enter into "any city of the Samaritans." But they were not forbidden to traverse their territory. He himself is mentioned as being among the Samaritans on two separate occasions during the last period of his ministry, the five or six months preceding his crucifixion (Luke ix. 51 *sq.*, xvii. 11 *sq.*). Lange, indeed, supposes that a considerable part of this period was spent in the Samaritan borders.

Far too much stress has been laid in the interpretation of the gospel narrative on the hostility and supposed non-intercourse between Jews and Samaritans. "Jews have no dealings with Samaritans," — the Evangelist's annotation to the question of the woman of Samaria, — obviously means "no needless, friendly, or familiar intercourse with them." What Edersheim, a high authority on a question of this sort, says of Christ, applies also in measure to John the Baptist. "Such prejudices in regard to Samaria, as those which affected the ordinary Judean devotee, would, of course, not influence the conduct of Jesus. But great as these undoubtedly were, they have been unduly exaggerated by modern writers, misled by one-sided quotations from Rabbinical works" (*Jesus the Messiah*, i., p. 295). Also: "Samaria appears [*i.e.*, in the Rabbis] merely as a strip intervening between Judea and Galilee, being the land of the Cuthæans. Nevertheless, it was not regarded like heathen lands, but pronounced clean" (p. 398). Again, of the Samaritans: "They were not treated as heathen, and their land, their springs, baths, houses, and roads were declared clean" (p. 400).

One more point specially concerns the broader interpretation of the gospel narrative, and this will conclude the discussion. Our Lord's two days' ministry in Sychar is unique. In the whole history it has

no parallel. Among the Samaritans of this city he found a large, intelligent faith, such as met him nowhere else. He seems to have wrought no miracles ; he was not even challenged to produce "a sign out of heaven" ; faith followed the spoken word. Whence this faith, this intelligence? Who had instructed this people? Who had sown the seed that now sprang up into this white harvest? If the Baptist had been for some time preaching in the immediate neighborhood, within five miles distance, the question is answered. "Others had labored," as our Lord at the time reminds his disciples. Here in a remarkable manner John had fulfilled his prophetic mission, and, in the words of the angel, had made ready for his Lord "a prepared people."

The Syriac Manuscript of the Union Theological Seminary of New York.

PROF. ISAAC H. HALL, PH.D.

THIS MS. was obtained from the neighborhood of Mardîn, in Mesopotamia, by the Rev. Alpheus N. Andrus, and by him presented to the Union Theological Seminary in March, 1872. It consists, in its present shape, of 146 leaves of rather thick parchment, one of them a mere fragment, but each entire leaf being $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ inches in dimension. The present binding, very dilapidated, of which only fragments of the back and one (wooden board) side remain, is pretty certainly three centuries old. The middle portions of the MS. are in fair preservation, but toward each end many leaves are more or less decayed, discolored, and obscured by the action of water and dirt. Very few portions of it, however, present any serious difficulty in deciphering, though some of them require a little close and slow work.

The sheets are arranged in *quiniones*, or quires of five folios or ten leaves each. The writing is in two columns to the page, each column regularly $1\frac{3}{4}$ inches wide by $5\frac{1}{2}$ inches high, and the space between the columns about $\frac{3}{8}$ of an inch wide. All these measurements vary somewhat, but the size of the written page is generally $5\frac{1}{2} \times 3\frac{7}{8}$ inches. The number of lines in a column is usually 24, but it varies from 21 to 26.

At present, the first three quires are gone; the MS. now beginning with a fragment of the first leaf of *quinio* 4, in Matt. xx. 22. This fragment, however, contains only portions of Matt. xx. 22, 23; xxi. 4-7. The real beginning is with Fol. 2, at Matt. xxi. 10. No gap then occurs till we pass Fol. 99, after which two leaves are missing, one the last leaf of *quinio* 13, and the other the first leaf of *quinio* 14, causing the loss of Luke xxxiii. 21 to xxxiv. 9 (latter part of the verse). Of these two missing leaves, the first has doubtless been *cut away since the MS. came to America*; the other was apparently lost by the natural wearing through of the outer folio of the *quinio*. The next break occurs in the last quire now present of the MS., the seventh and eighth

leaves of the *quinio* being gone, carrying away John xxi. 17 (latter part of the verse) to the end of the Gospel, and of the Epistle of James from its beginning to ii. 2 (first part of the verse). The present end of the MS. is in James ii. 26, first four words of the verse; to which a later hand has added the rest of the verse, occupying four lines in the lower margin. This later hand undoubtedly belongs to the same period as the present binding, or about three centuries ago. The addition seems to have been made merely to give a clean end to the already mutilated MS.

The MS. thus contained originally the four Gospels and the Epistle of James, and probably all of the Catholic Epistles used by the Syrians (James, 1 Peter, 1 John). If it contained no more than that (a supposition favored by the general make and size of the volume), the codex would have been complete with one more *quinio*; and would have contained originally 19 *quiniones*, or 190 leaves, or 380 pages.

The writing is in the old Jacobite character, of a style which seems to be of the twelfth century. (Mr. Andrus, the giver of the MS. to the Seminary, considered it to be about 800 years old; but he seems to me to put it a century too early.) It is much later than the Beirût MS., which belongs to the same general style or class of writing; for it intermingles much later forms of the letters, besides being written throughout in a later style. Rarely, except in lesson-numbers, a letter occurs in Estrangela. One line, at the bottom of a column (three words of Luke xxii. 29, Fol. 98, b. 2), is written entirely in the Estrangela.

Punctuation is used with the usual significance and insignificance of Syriac MSS.; the end of a line or the beginning of a church-lesson note being often considered a sufficient indication of punctuation without any further marks. Often, the upper dot of a *rish*, the lower dot of a *dolath*, the point which denotes the feminine suffix, pronoun, and the like, are made to do extra duty as a punctuation mark; being in such cases pushed forward from their normal positions — either to serve the purpose of a single punctuation dot, or part of a double one. In the case of final *nun*, a single dot so often coalesces with its heavy end in such ways that it is impossible to tell exactly what punctuation is intended. The red diamond with a black centre occurs frequently, marking rhetorical significance, or some ecclesiastical or reference division, rather than any syntactical force. Where the diamond of four dots (two vertical red, two horizontal black) is used at the end of a line, the next line often has a red dot at the be-

ginning. The *verso* of each leaf, as in many Syriac MSS., is marked with a diamond of black dots in the upper outer corner.

Abbreviations are rare, except in the church-lesson notes, in which they are the rule. Otherwise, they are confined almost entirely to the words for "glory," with its derivatives, and to that for "disciples." Vowels of the Greek sort are not rare throughout the MS. Some of these are of the first hand; others were apparently added by some late reader to guide his voice.

Grammatical diacritic punctuation is frequent enough to keep the sense generally clear. Vocalization by points is neither rare nor very common. In some portions of the MS. are to be seen specimens of the peculiar compound vowelizing noted in Wiseman's *Horæ Syriacæ*, pages 191-193; which also occurs rarely in the Peshitto portion of the Beirût MS.

The writing is generally done with considerable care and accuracy. Wherever words or letters have been omitted, or other slips made, the correction has been made generally by the original scribe or a contemporary hand, either above or below the line, or in the margin, with a proper reference mark (usually a small diamond of black dots).

Ornaments scarcely occur at all. The only thing of the sort is the diamond, composed of dot-diamonds, which surrounds the *quinio*-number at the beginning and end of each quire; besides here and there some dot-diamonds to fill out a line, and a few ornamental tails to letters—likewise attached for the purpose of filling a short blank at the end of a line.

The writing is continuous, without any break from the beginning to the end of a book. The (Jacobite) church-lessons are noted in vermilion letters (with the diacritic points in black), in the body of the text; these rubrics being much abbreviated. The numbers of these lessons, as they now appear, though written in Estrangela, are in a different ink and a much later hand than the rest of the MS.; and in many places there are evidences in them not only of a re-writing, but of an erasure before re-writing. In a few places the older number is still legible; but whether its writing is contemporary with the first scribe cannot now be determined.

The MS. was doubtless originally provided with the Syriac section (ܩܝܢܝܐ) numbers, written mostly in red. But of these numbers only the following now remain: In Matthew, 17, 19, 20, 22; in Mark, 1 (written in black), 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12; in Luke, 2, 6 (written in black), 11, 22 (written erroneously 25 or 26, it being uncertain whether an Estrangela *he* or *waw* has accidentally replaced the re-

quired *beth*) ; in John, 12. These numbers are generally, but not always, written exactly at the beginning of the section to which they belong ; but they always mark the page or column on which the division occurs.

The titles and subscriptions to the Gospels are very simple in form. The following is a translation of those that are still present : —

Subscription to Matthew : " Ends the Gospel of Matthew the Apostle, which he spoke in Hebrew in Palestine."

Title to Mark : " Holy Gospel, the preaching of Mark the Evangelist."

Subscription to Mark : " End of the preaching of Mark, which he spoke in Latin in Rome."

Title to Luke : " Holy Gospel, the preaching of Luke the Evangelist."

Subscription to Luke : " Ends the Holy Gospel, the preaching of Luke, which he spoke in Greek in Alexandria the Great."

Title to John : " Holy Gospel, the preaching of John the Apostle."

Besides the titles and subscriptions, it seems best to give the church-lesson notes in full. Technical students will find it of value. The numbers are given as they occur in the MS. ; in which the reader will perceive some continued mistakes. Generally, the numbers are those of a late hand ; but the few instances in which they are (still) legible in an older hand are marked with a *. Sometimes, but very rarely, the older and the later hands are both legible. In a few instances there is an illegible spot. Such are denoted either by . . . or by a conjectural supply of the deficiency in brackets.

List of Church-Lessons.

NO.	PASSAGE.	LESSON.
51.	Matt. xxi. 23.	Of Tuesday of [Passion] week, at vespers; and 13th of Resurrection. ¹
52.	" xxi. 33.	Of Stephen, at vespers; and of the martyrs, at vespers.
53.	" xxii. 1.	Of the fifth Sunday of Epiphany; and Monday of Passion week.
54.	" xxii. 15.	Of Passion Monday, at midday.
55.	" xxii. 23.	Of the Saturday of Rest, at matins; and of the departed, at vespers.
55.	" xxii. 34.	Of Passion Tuesday, at matins.
57.	" xxiii. 1.	Of Passion Monday, at matins.
58.	" xxiii. 25.	And Monday of Passion week, at the third hour; and of the martyrs, at the oblation.
59.	" xxiv. 1.	At vespers of the Feast of the Cross; . . . of the Resurrection, at matins.

¹ That is, 13th Sunday; 12th Sunday after Easter. Where a number occurs without the name of the day, it stands for a Sunday.

NO.	PASSAGE.	LESSON.
60.	Matt. xxiv. 34.	Of the Supplication.
61.	" xxiv. 41.	Of the Priests, at vespers.
62.	" xxv. 1.	Approach to the gate (ܕܡܚܠܐ ܕܡܚܠܐ). ¹
63.	" xxv. 13.	Of Bishops and Priests, at the oblation.
64.	" xxv. 31.	Of Friday of Confessors, at matins; and of the vigils of the brethren, at vespers.
65.	" xxvi. 6.	Of Thursday of the Mysteries, at vespers.
66.	" xxvi. 17.	Of Thursday of the Mysteries, at matins.
67.	" xxvi. 31.	Of the great season of the night of the Crucifixion.
68.	" xxvi. 46.	Of the third ministration of the night of the Crucifixion.
69.	" xxvi. 59.	Of the . . . ministration of the night of the Crucifixion.
70.	" xxvii. 1.	Of matins of the Friday of the Crucifixion.
71.	" xxvii. 27.	Of the third hour of the Crucifixion.
72.	" xxvii. 57.	Of the Saturday of Annunciation, at vespers.
73.	" xxvii. 63.	Of the Saturday of Annunciation, at matins.
74.	" xxviii. 1.	Of the second Sunday of the Resurrection, at vespers.
75.	" xxviii. 11.	Of the second of Rest, at matins.
76.	" xxviii. 16.	Of the Ascension, at the oblation.
1.*	Mark i. 1.	Of the Season of the Epiphany, at vespers.
2.	" i. 14.	Of the second Sunday after Epiphany, at matins.
3.*	" i. 32.	Of the second Sunday of Lent, at vespers.
4.*	" ii. 1.	Of the third Sunday of Lent, at vespers.
5.	" ii. 23.	Of the fourth Saturday of Lent.
6.	" iii. 13.	Of the Mother of God (<i>Deipara</i>), at vespers.
7.	" iv. 1.	Of the sixth Sunday after Epiphany, at matins.
8.	" iv. 35.	Of the third Sunday of Lent, at matins.
9.	" v. 21.	Of the fourteenth Sunday, at vespers.
10.	" vi. 14.	Of John the Baptist, at vespers.
11.	" vi. 34.	Of the oblation, of any day.
12.	" vii. 17.	Of the eleventh of Resurrection, at vespers.
13.	" viii. 1.	Of the oblation, of any day.
14.	" viii. 11.	Of the Tuesday of Rest, at vespers.
15.	" viii. 28.	Of the Dedication of a church, at the oblation.
16.	" viii. 34.	Of the Resurrection, at vespers; and of the Prophets, at matins; and of the Tabernacles.
17.	" ix. 9.	Of the Saturday of Rest, at vespers.
18.	" ix. 30.	Of the tenth Sunday of the Resurrection, at matins.
19.	" ix. 42.	Of the twenty-fourth of the Resurrection, at vespers; and of the Supplications.
20.	" x. 1.	Of the nineteenth of the Resurrection, at matins.

¹ In explaining this term, Castel's Lexicon makes a very gross mistake in citing J. S. Assemani, under the word **ܕܡܚܠܐ**, p. 237. For Castel's (or Michaelis's) "usque ad hanc dominicam," read "usque ad hoc tempus appellatur Syris." This feast was one day only. To explain the matter fully would take too much space here.

NO.	PASSAGE.	LESSON.
21.	Mark x. 32.	Of the twenty-ninth Sunday, at matins; and of the thirty-third ¹ of the Passion, of the first ministration of the night.
22.	" x. 46.	Of Hosanna, at matins.
23.	" xi. 15.	Of Passion Tuesday, of the second ministration of the night.
24.	" xi. 27.	Of Passion Monday, at matins.
25.	" xii. 1.	Of Passion Tuesday, in the night, at the third ministration.
26.	" xii. 13.	Of Passion Monday, in the night, of the first ministration.
27.	" xii. 28.	Of the third of the Resurrection, at matins.
28.	" xiii. 1.	Of the night of Passion Tuesday, at the fourth ministration; and of the Feast of the Cross, at matins.
29.	" xiii. 14.	Of the fourth night.
30.	" xiv. 1.	Of Saint (Holy) Mûrûn. [The patron saint of the Maronites.]
31.	" xiv. 12.	Of Thursday of the Mysteries, at the oblation.
32.	" xiv. 43.	Of the second ministration of the night of the Crucifixion.
33.	" xvi. 1.	Of the great Sunday of the Resurrection, at night.
34.	" xvi. 12.	Of the Ascension, at matins.
1.	Luke i. 1.	Of the Annunciation of (to) Zacharias, at vespers.
2.	" i. 18.	Of the Annunciation of (to) Zacharias, at matins.
[3. ²]	" i. 26.	Of the Annunciation of (to) the Mother of God (<i>Deipara</i>).
3.	" i. 39.	Of the entry of Mary to Elisabeth.
4.	" i. 57.	Of the birth of John.
5.	" ii. 1.	Of the night of the Nativity of Our Lord.
6.	" ii. 21.	Of the entry of Our Lord to the Temple, at vespers.
7.	" ii. 33.	Of the entry, at matins.
8.	" ii. 40.	Of the Sunday after the Nativity, at vespers.
9.	" iii. 1.	Of the Epiphany, at the oblation.
10.	" iii. 15.	Of the Sunday after Nativity, at matins.
11.	" iii. 23.	Of the first Sunday of Nativity, at matins.
12.	" iv. 1.	Of the Sunday that Lent comes in, at the oblation.
13.	" iv. 14.	Of the fourth Sunday after Epiphany, at vespers.
14.	" iv. 25.	Of the Supplications; and of the Failure of Rain.
15.	" iv. 31.	Of the fifth Sunday of Lent, at the oblation.
16.	" v. 1.	Of the fifth Sunday after Epiphany, at matins.
17.	" v. 27.	Of the fourth Sunday of the Crucifixion, at matins.
18.	" vi. 6.	Of the first Saturday of Lent, at the oblation.
19.	" vii. 1.	Of the fourth Sunday of Lent, at matins.
20.*	" vii. 11.	Of the fifth Sunday of Lent, at vespers.
21. ³	" vii. 18.	Of the Sunday after Epiphany, at vespers.

¹ If this is the right rendering, there is an error in the number (*gomal-lomad* for *lomad-gomal*). But if not an error, it is an abbreviation which I cannot solve, unless it be for "revelation," which makes no sense. If the *lomad* were absent, it would mean "Tuesday," which may be the right meaning.

² This number has been erased, but can still be made out.

³ Numbers 21 to 29 (inclusive), following, were written 31 to 39, but have been

NO.	PASSAGE.	LESSON.
22.	Luke vii. 36.	Of the Thursday night of the mysteries, of the second time.
23.	" viii. 1.	Of the twenty-second of the Resurrection, at vespers.
24.	" viii. 40.	Of the fifth Sunday of Lent, at matins.
25.	" ix. 1.	Of John the Baptist, at the oblation.
26.	" ix. 11.	Of the oblation, of any day.
27.	" ix. 27.	Of the Feast of Tabernacles, at matins.
28.	" ix. 51.	Of the sixth Sunday of the Resurrection, at vespers.
29.	" x. 17.	Of the thirty-third of the Resurrection, at vespers.
40.	" x. 25.	Of the sixth Sunday of Lent, at vespers.
41.	" xi. 1.	Of the sixth Sunday of the Resurrection, at matins.
42.	" xi. 23.	Of the Mother of God (<i>Deipara</i>), at matins.
43.	" xi. 37.	Of the eighteenth of Resurrection, at matins.
44.	" xi. 52.	Of the twenty-third of the Resurrection, at vespers.
45.	" xii. 16.	Of the twenty-seventh of the Resurrection, at vespers.
46.	" xii. 31.	Of the Passion, at the third hour; and twenty-sixth of the Resurrection; and of the Saints, at vespers.
47.	" xii. 49.	Of the twenty-third of the Resurrection, at matins; and of the Supplications.
48.	" xiii. 1.	Of the twenty-first of the Resurrection, at vespers.
49.	" xiii. 10.	Of the twenty-fifth of the Resurrection, at matins.
50.	" xiii. 18.	Of the night of Wednesday of Passion week, at the first ministration.
51.	" xiii. 31.	Of Passion Tuesday, at the ninth hour.
52.	" xiv. 7.	Of the twelfth of the Resurrection, at matins; and of the thirtieth of Resurrection, at vespers.
53.	" xiv. 25.	Of the twenty-first of the Resurrection, at matins; and of the tonsure of monks.
54.	" xv. 1.	Of the fourteenth of the Resurrection, at matins.
55.	" xv. 11.	Of the Wednesday of Rest, at matins; and twenty-seventh of the Resurrection, at matins.
56.	" xv. 33.	Of the Thursday of Rest, at vespers.
57.	" xvi. 19.	Of the thirty-first of the Resurrection, at vespers.
58.	" xvii. 5.	Of the sixteenth Sunday of the Resurrection, at matins.
59.	" xvii. 10.	Of the second Sunday of Lent, at the oblation.
60.	" xvii. 20.	Of the night of Passion Tuesday, at the third ministration, at vespers.
61.	" xviii. 1.	Of Passion Thursday, at matins.
62.	" xviii. 35.	Of the sixth Sunday of Lent, at the oblation.
63.	" xix. 1.	Of the eleventh of the Resurrection, at matins.
64.	" xix. 11.	Of the Priests; and twenty-fourth of the Resurrection, at matins.
65.	" xix. 28.	Of the Hosanna, in the night.
66.	" xix. 47.	Of Passion Monday, at vespers.

corrected by erasing the upper end of the *lomad*, so as to make it read *'ee*. But after 29 the error is suffered to remain uncorrected; and what should be 30-68 are written 40-78.

NO.	PASSAGE.	LESSON.
67.	Luke xx. 9.	Of the night of Passion Monday, at the second ministration.
68.	" xxi. 5.	Of the night of Passion Tuesday, at the second ministration; and of the Feast of the Cross, at the oblation.
69.	" xxi. 25.	Of the third ministration of Passion Wednesday, at night; and of the Supplications.
70.	" xxii. 1.	Of the Thursday of the mysteries, at night, the third time.
71.	" xxii. 31.	Of the Thursday of the mysteries, at the third hour.
72.	" xxii. 39.	Of the night of the Crucifixion, at the first ministration.
73.	" xxii. 65.	Of the third hour of the Crucifixion. [Two leaves gone here.]
77.	" xxiv. 13.	Of the Monday of Rest, at vespers.
78.	" xxiv. 36.	Of the Ascension, at vespers.
1.	John i. 1.	Of the Nativity, at the oblation; and after the Nativity, at matins.
2.	" i. 19.	Of the first Sunday after Epiphany, at vespers.
3.	" i. 29.	Of the first Sunday after Epiphany, at matins.
4.	" i. 43.	Of the Sunday after Epiphany, at matins [<i>sic</i>].
5.	" ii. 1.	Of the Sunday of the coming in of Lent, at vespers.
6.	" ii. 12.	Of the Saturday of Lazarus, at the oblation.
7.	" ii. 18.	Of the Tuesday of Rest, at matins.
8.	" iii. 1.	Of the Baptism; and the thirty-second Sunday of the Resurrection, at vespers.
9.	" iii. 13.	Of the thirty-second of the Resurrection, at matins.
10.	" iii. 22.	Of the third Sunday after Epiphany, at vespers.
11.	" iv. 4.	Of the beginning of the waters in the night of Epiphany; and the adoration of Pentecost.
	iv. 42.	End [of the preceding lesson].
12.	" iv. 46.	Of the third Sunday after the Resurrection, at vespers.
13.	" v. 1.	Of the twelfth Sunday of Resurrection, at vespers.
14.	" v. 19.	Of the vigil of the brethren, at the oblation; and of the departed, at matins.
15.	" v. 30.	Of the third Sunday after Epiphany, at matins; and Thursday of the mysteries, at midday.
16.	" vi. 5.	Of the oblation, of any day.
17.	" vi. 16.	Of the fourth Sunday of Lent, at the oblation.
18.	" vi. 22.	Of the twenty-second of the Resurrection, at matins.
19.	" vi. 47.	Of the oblation, of any day.
20.	" vi. 58.	Of Passion Wednesday, at vespers.
21.	" vii. 14.	Of the third hour of the fourth Wednesday of the earthquakes; and the twenty-sixth Sunday of the Resurrection, at matins.
22.	" vii. 28.	Of midday of the Wednesday of the earthquakes.
23.	" vii. 37.	Of the Thursday evening of the mysteries; and the twenty-eighth of the Resurrection, at matins.
24.	" vii. 45.	Of the fifth Saturday of Lent.
25.	" viii. 21.	Of the night of Passion Tuesday, at the fourth ministration.
26.	" viii. 28.	Of the Wednesday of the earthquakes, at the ninth hour.

NO.	PASSAGE.	LESSON.
27.	John viii. 39.	Of Stephen, at the oblation.
28.	" ix. 1.	Of the sixth Sunday of Lent, at matins; and of the thirty-fourth of Resurrection, at matins.
29.	" x. 1.	Of the Doctors (teachers) Basillius [<i>sic</i>] and Gregorius; and thirty-fifth of the Resurrection, at matins.
30.	" x. 22.	Of the consecration of a church, at matins.
31.	" xi. 1.	Of the Saturday of Lazarus; and of Peace (or Rest) for the departed.
32.	" xi. 39.	Of Lazarus, at matins.
33.	" xi. 47.	Of the Wednesday of the earthquakes, at matins.
34.	" xi. 55.	Of the Thursday of the mysteries, at night, and at the first ministration.
35.	" xii. 12.	Of the Sunday of Hosannas, at the oblation.
36.	" xii. 23.	Of Passion Tuesday, at midday.
37.	" xiii. 1.	Of the Washing [of the feet], of Thursday of the mysteries.
38.	" xiii. 20.	Of the night of Wednesday of the earthquakes, at the second ministration.
39.	" xiv. 1.	Of the ninth hour of Passion Monday.
40.	" xiv. 15.	Of the vespers of the Sunday of Pentecost.
41.	" xiv. 28.	Of the first season of the night of the Crucifixion.
42.	" xv. 20.	Of Pentecost, at matins.
33 [<i>sic</i>] ¹ .	xvi. 16.	Of Pentecost, at oblation.
34. John	xvi. 23.	Of the twentieth Sunday of the Resurrection, at matins.
35.	" xvii. 1.	Of the seventh of the Resurrection, at vespers.
36.	" xvii. 12.	Of the night of Thursday of the mysteries, at the fourth ministration.
37.	" xviii. 1.	Of the night of the Crucifixion, at the second ministration.
38.	" xviii. 28.	Of the Friday of the Crucifixion, at matins.
	" (xix. 7,	red letter <i>gof</i> above the line, signifying probably <i>first</i> , or else oblation. The number 38 is repeated at xix. 26, but without a lesson note.)
39.	" xix. 38.	Of the Saturday of glad tidings (or, of expectation), at matins.
40.	" xx. 1.	Of the great Thursday of the Resurrection.
41.	" xx. 19.	Of the dawn of New Sunday.
41 [<i>sic-bis</i>].	xx. 26.	Of matins of New Sunday.
42. John	xxi. 1.	Of New Sunday, at the oblation.
43.	" xxi. 15.	Of Simeon Cephas; of Bishops. (Also a red <i>gof</i> in the margin, as at xix. 7.)

With regard to text, this MS. coincides almost exactly with the American editions (Urn and New York, both Amer. Bib. Soc.), as well as with that of the original Widmanstadt edition of 1555; and steers clear of the numerous variations of sundry European editions

¹ From this point to the end, the numbers are all too small by ten.

(especially English) which were introduced on inferior authority or on mere conjecture. Except in printer's slips on the one hand, or manifest errors on the other, the coincidence of the American and the Widmanstadt text with that of this MS. is so close that collation becomes very monotonous, and is confined mostly to noting peculiarities of punctuation and spelling. A collation of either with the far too highly praised text of Lee or Greenfield would disclose many more differences.

This negative fact is to be taken as evidence of the general excellence of the MS., as representing a text certainly very ancient, and received alike in all the divergent Syrian churches. Besides this, it may be added that the MS. is very carefully written, with comparatively few slips of the scribe; and in the great majority of cases, those slips are corrected either by the scribe himself or by a contemporary hand.

As might be expected, this MS. omits the passages not ordinarily found in Syriac MSS., or which are bracketed in the better printed editions after they were once introduced; such as John vii. 53-viii. 11; Luke xxii. 17, 18. As to those actually erroneous readings preferred by the Syrians, such as "heavy" for "burning" in Luke xxiv.-32, this MS. follows the Widmanstadt and the American editions. Another case (not erroneous, however), all the more interesting from its disappearance from most other editions, even in the various readings, is ܠܠܝܢ for ܠܠܝܢ, as a rendering of *ῥαββονι* in John xx. 16.

The main differences between this MS. and the American (New York, 1874) edition are in the spelling of the Syriac words for Jews, Herod, Herodias, Rome, Peter, Soldier, Israel, Andrew, and other transliterated or foreign words; the exchange of a longer for a shorter grammatical form, or the reverse; the writing of compound words as separate ones, and the reverse; some slight variations in spelling; the addition or omission of a prefix *waw*, or of a prefix *dolath*, or of a *waw* in the termination, with effect either *nil* or idiomatic only, and in the punctuation. Rarely there is an exchange of one equivalent for another, e.g., Mark viii. 9. ܐܢܬܝܢ for ܐܢܬܝܢ; or of the pronoun for the noun, e.g., Mark v. 46, ܠܠܝܢ for ܠܠܝܢ; or of one word for another of nearly the same purport but different meaning, e.g., Mark x. 50, ܠܠܝܢ for ܠܠܝܢ. Of additions, there is scarcely anything worse than that of "Amen" before "I say" in Luke xiii. 25; or of transpositions, anything worse than "Elias and Moses" for "Moses and Elias" in Mark ix. 4; while the worst omission left uncorrected by

the scribe appears to be in Mark i. 6, of the words for "and was there in the wilderness" (homoiotelenton of one line).

I have full material for presenting further differences, having carefully collated the whole MS.; but I do not suppose that a detailed statement of the results is called for in this article.

Notes.

Luke xxiv. 32 in Syriac.

BY PROF. I. H. HALL, PH.D.

IN the *Proceedings of the American Oriental Society* of October, 1880, pp. xxxvi., xxxvii., I have shown that the reading of the Curetonian Syriac, of "heavy" for "burning," in Luke xxiv. 32, said by Scrivener (*Plain Introd. to N. T. Criticism*, 2d ed., p. 285; 3d ed., p. 324) to be "a variation supported only by those precarious allies the Thebaic and (apparently) the American versions," is not only the Peshitto and the Harklensian reading, but the reading known and preferred by the Nestorian and Jacobite ecclesiastics, and the common one in use by the Syrians. Sundry conjectures have been indulged in as to the Greek which underlay this variant; though it consists only in a point placed at the *top* of a letter instead of the bottom, making the letter *rish* instead of *dolath*. But on examining the Peshitto, the origin of the first scribe's error is manifest. In verse 25 of the same chapter, the same Syriac phrase (with the *rish*) is used to render *βραδεῖς τῇ καρδίᾳ*; and it was most natural for the Syrian scribe to suppose that the disciples, in verse 32, were repeating the same expression, and that the *dolath* in the translator's draught, or other correct copy, was probably an oversight. Of course the error is that of a copyist only; for the translator, with the Greek before him, would not be misled. It is plain, too, that the Syriac word for "heavy" in verse 32, stands, in the Syriac mind, for an imaginary Greek *βραδεῖα*, and for nothing else. The Syrian reader supposes the disciples to be repeating and applying to themselves the reproach of Christ uttered in verse 25; and it is not strange that the Syrians, when apprised of the true reading, should still prefer their common one of "heavy." See, on this point, Dr. Justin Perkins's *Eight Years in Persia*, pp. 16, 17. A comparison of the Peshitto rendering of Luke xxi. 34 (the phrase *βαρυνθῶσιν ὑμῶν αἱ καρδίαι*) will throw a little more light on the general subject.

It should be said, however, that the real error probably goes back to the time when the Syriac *dolath* and *rish* were indistinguishable; and

that when the diacritic point came to be applied, it followed the common understanding, which chose what seemed to be the more appropriate of two good senses.

Job xix. 25-27.

BY REV. J. I. MOMBERT, D.D.

IN the *Journal* for June and December, 1882, beginning p. 27, is a paper on this passage. The exact Greek text of the passage, as it stands in the printed editions of the Alexandrian and Vatican Manuscripts, and in the Complutensian Polyglot, herewith supplied, may be useful for reference.

A. *Codex Alexandrinus (Baber), Lond. 1821.*

ΟΙΔΑ ΓΑΡ ΟΤΙ ΑΕΝΑΟC ΕCΤΙΝ Ο ΕΚ
 ΑΤΕΙΝ ΜΕ ΜΕΛΛΩΝ ΕΠΙ ΓΗC
 ΑΝΑCΤΗCΕΙ ΔΕ ΜΟΤ ΤΟ CΩΜΑ ΤΟ
 ΑΝΑΝΤΛΟΥΝ ΤΑΤΤΑ·
 ΠΑΡΑ ΓΑΡ ΚΤ ΜΟΙ ΤΑΤΤΑ CΤΝΕΤΕΛΕCΘΗ
 Α ΕΓΩ ΕΜΑΤΤΩ CΤΝΕΠΙCΤΑΜΑΙ
 Α ΟΙ ΟΦΘΑΛΜΟΙ ΜΟΤ ΕΟΡΑΚΑCΙΝ
 ΚΑΙ ΟΤΚ ΑΛΛΟC ΠΑΝΤΑ ΔΕ ΜΟΙ
 CΤΝΤΕΤΕΛΕCΤΑΙ ΕΝ ΚΟΛΠΩ

B. *Codex Vaticanus, Romæ, 1871.*

ΟΙΔΑ ΓΑΡ ΟΤΙ ΑΕΝΑΟC ΕCΤΙΝ Ο ΕΚΑΤ
 ΕΙΝ ΜΕ ΜΕΛΛΩΝ
 ΕΠΙ ΓΗC ΑΝΑCΤΗCΑΙ ΤΟ ΔΕΡΜΑ ΜΟΤ
 ΤΟ ΑΝΑΝΤΛΟΥΝ ΤΑΤΤΑ
 ΠΑΡΑ ΓΑΡ ΚΤ ΤΑΤΤΑ ΜΟΙ CΤΝΕΤΕΛΕCΘΗ
 Α ΕΓΩ ΕΜΑΤΤΩ CΤΝΕΠΙCΤΑΜΑΙ
 Α Ο ΟΦΘΑΛΜΟC ΜΟΤ ΕΩΡΑΚΕΝ ΚΑΙ
 ΟΤΚ ΑΛΛΟC
 ΠΑΝΤΑ ΔΕ ΜΟΙ CΤΝΤΕΤΕΛΕCΤΑΙ
 ΕΝ ΚΟΛΠΩ

C. *Complutensian Polyglot.*

οἶδα ἐγὼ ὅτι ἀένναος ἐστὶν ὁ ἐκλύειν με μέλλων, ἐπὶ γῆς ἀναστῆσαι τὸ δέρμα ἡοῦ τὸ ἀναντλοῦν ταῦτα. παρὰ γὰρ κυρίου ταῦτά μοι συνετελέσθη, ἃ ἐγὼ ἐμαντῶ συνεπίσταμαι, ἃ ὀφθαλμός μου ἐώρακε, καὶ οὐκ ἄλλος, πάντα δέ μοι συνετελέεσται ἐν κόλπῳ.

Corrections.

BY PROF. ISAAC H. HALL, PH.D.

THE following corrections should be made in papers on the Beirût Codex and the Syriac Apocalypse, published in the *Journal* for June and December, 1882 : —

Page 4, line 15, for "128" read "98."

" 8, lines 15-19, *delete* the sentence beginning "Several instructive examples," with the one which follows in parenthesis. The peculiarity is one noted at several places in Wiseman's *Horæ Syriacæ*, and seems to serve another object. I have observed the same thing in other MSS., *e.g.*, in that of the Union Theological Seminary in New York. The statements made in the two sentences referred to rest, however, on the assurance of sundry native scholars, of whom the late Butrus el-Bistani, author of the *Mohut el-Mohit*, and an excellent Syriac scholar, was one. But it seems contradicted by other MS. phenomena and explanation.

" 16, line 6, for "1627" read "1630."

" 135, line 1 of foot-note, for "1565" read "1555."

" " lines 2 and 3 of foot-note, for "Guido" read "Guy."

" " line 4 of foot-note, *add* "Also a ninth, after the publication of the Pococke and De Dieu matter, viz., [Christian Knorr von Rosenroth,] Sulzbach, 1684."

" 136, lines 1, 20, for "Le Croze" read "La Croze."

" 137, line 16, for "J. J. Assemani" read "J. S. Assemani."

" 138, line 2, put a full stop in place of comma after "emendavi" (the old semi-period).

" " line 8, for "idem" read "item."

" " line 10, for "commississe" read "commisise."

" " line 15, put full stop after "fuissent" (the old semi-period).

Other less important corrections, especially in the accentuation of some of the Greek words, will easily be made by the reader.

Proceedings.

THE eighth meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis was held in the Chapel of the Union Theological School, December 27, 1883.

The Society met in accordance with the arrangements of the committee at 9 A.M.

In the absence of both the President and the Vice-President, Rev. M. S. Terry, D.D., was called to the chair.

The minutes of the last meeting were read and approved.

The Committee of Arrangements reported the following programme : Morning session, 9-12.30 ; recess, 12.30-2 ; afternoon session 2-5.30 ; recess, 5.30-7.30 ; evening session, 7.30 onward ; which was adopted, as also the further recommendation that the first part of the afternoon session be devoted to necessary business, and the hour immediately following to brief notes.

The first paper, on "The Independent Legislation of Deuteronomy," was read by Prof. E. C. Bissell, D.D., and discussed by various members of the Society.

The second paper, on "Recent Discussions of Rom. ix. 5," by Prof. Ezra Abbott, D.D., in the absence of the author on account of illness, was read by Prof. Francis Brown.

The third paper, on "The Readings Ἑλλῆνας and Ἑλληνιστάς," by Prof. B. B. Warfield, D.D., who also could not be present, was read by the Secretary.

Before it was quite completed, the time fixed for closing the session arrived, and a recess was taken.

At 2 P.M. the Society re-assembled, and at once proceeded to the transaction of business.

Pursuant to a recommendation of the Council, it was voted that thenceforth back numbers of the *Journal* be sold singly, to members elected after their publication, at one dollar a copy.

The following persons were recommended by the Council, and elected to membership in the Society :—

Prof. C. R. Brown, Newton Centre, Mass.

Rev. P. A. Nordell, New London, Conn.

Rev. J. P. Peters, Ph.D.,	Cor. 99th St. and 10th Ave., New York, N.Y.
Rev. W. M. Taylor, D.D., LL.D.,	5 West 35th St., New York, N.Y.
Prof. H. M. Scott,	Congregational Theol. Sem., Chicago, Ill.
Rev. Jacob Streibert,	West Haven, Conn.
Prof. E. B. Andrews,	Providence, R.I.
Prof. E. D. Burton,	Newton Centre, Mass.
Rev. J. J. McCook,	114 Main St., Hartford, Conn.
Prof. J. W. Lindsay, D.D.,	12 Somerset St., Boston, Mass.
Rev. F. A. Henry,	Ridgefield, Conn.
Prof. J. F. Genung, Ph.D.,	Amherst, Mass.
Prof. D. M. Welton, Ph.D.,	Toronto, Canada.
Prof. G. T. Ladd, D.D.,	New Haven, Conn.

The Society further adopted the recommendation of the Council to the effect that Hartford, Conn., be the place of the next meeting, and Profs. Bissell and Hart, and Rev. Mr. Andrews, a committee to fix the date, and make all necessary arrangements.

At the conclusion of these matters of business, it was voted that the presentation of the brief notes, which were next in order, be deferred, in order that Prof. W. A. Stevens might read his paper on "Ænon near to Salim," which was followed by a short discussion.

Among the notes afterwards offered were the following: —

One by Prof. I. H. Hall, Ph.D., on Luke xxiv. 32 in Syriac.

One by Prof. Francis Brown, on the Gospel of Matthew in a MS. of the National Library at Paris, edited by John Wordsworth, A.M.

One by Rev. J. I. Mombert, D.D., on Ziegler's series of printed editions of the ante-Hieronymian portions of the Italic text, with a reference to the speaker's edition of Tyndale's Pentateuch in process of publication.

One by Rev. W. H. Ward, D.D., on Ps. xci. 4, as illustrated by the decorations on the Bowl of Palestrina. See *Le Journal Asiatique*, 1878.

A second by Dr. Hall, on two Greek MSS., — one a copy of Chrysostom's Homilies on Ephesians, and his Hermeneia on Galatians; the other, a Lexicon in the Philadelphia Library, — and two liturgical works in the possession of Hiram Hitchcock, Esq., of New York.

At the close of the hour devoted to these notes, Rev. J. I. Mombert, D.D., requested permission, which was granted, to read his paper on "The Tridentine Decrees concerning the Holy Scriptures, and the History of the Official Text of the Scriptures of the Church of Rome."

The discussion which followed this paper elicited much that was interesting concerning the Latin MSS. of the Bible.

At this point, it was moved and voted that the meeting close with the session then in progress, but that the session be extended long enough to allow the presentation of the papers yet to be read.

Prof. I. H. Hall, Ph.D., then gave the Society a description of "The Union Theological Seminary's Syriac MS. of the Gospels, etc."

Dr. Mombert asked permission to publish, in the next volume of the *Journal*, some additions to an article in that of 1882.

It was voted to authorize the Council to publish the papers read during the year as far as the funds on hand would permit.

The remainder of Prof. Warfield's paper was then read, and one by Rev. B. Pick, Ph.D., on "The History of the Printed Text of the Old Testament," was read by its title.

There were present at one or both sessions of the meeting, Drs. Buttz, Crosby, Hitchcock, Mombert, and Terry; Profs. Ballantine, Beckwith, Bissell, Briggs, Brown, Gardiner, Hall, Harper, Hart, Mitchell, Moore, and Stevens; Revs. Gillett, Micou, Rice, and Riggs.

A rough copy of the minutes was read and corrected, after which the Society, at 6.30, adjourned.

H. G. MITCHELL,
Secretary.

LIST OF MEMBERS.

Members are requested to give the Secretary notice of changes in their addresses.

Prof. Ezra Abbot, D.D., LL.D.,*	23 Berkeley St., Cambridge, Mass.
Rev. S. J. Andrews,	956 Asylum Ave., Hartford, Conn.
Rt. Rev. M. S. Baldwin, D.D.,	London, Ont.
Prof. W. G. Ballantine,	Oberlin, O.
Pres. S. C. Bartlett, D.D., LL.D.,	Hanover, N.H.
Prof. I. T. Beckwith, Ph.D.,	Hartford, Conn.
Prof. Willis J. Beecher, D.D.,	Auburn, N.Y.
Prof. John Binney,	Middletown, Conn.
Prof. E. C. Bissell, D.D.,	Hartford, Conn.
Prof. C. A. Briggs, D.D.,	Union Theol. Sem., New York, N.Y.
Prof. C. R. Brown,	Newton Centre, Mass.

* Died March 21, 1884.

Prof. Francis Brown,	Union Theol. Sem., New York, N.Y.
Prof. E. D. Burton,	Newton Centre, Mass.
Prof. H. A. Buttz, D.D.,	Madison, N.J.
Pres. W. C. Cattell, D.D.,	Easton, Penn.
Rev. T. W. Chambers, D.D.,	70 West 36th St., New York, N.Y.
Pres. Thomas Chase, LL.D.,	Haverford Coll., Montgomery Co., Penn.
Rev. W. H. Cobb,	Uxbridge, Mass.
Rev. Howard Crosby, D.D., LL.D.,	116 East 19th St., New York, N.Y.
Rev. E. R. Craven, D.D.,	Newark, N.J.
Prof. E. L. Curtis,	1060 North Halsted St., Chicago, Ill.
Prof. S. I. Curtiss, D.D.,	364 Washington Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
Prof. G. E. Day, D.D.,	New Haven, Conn.
Prof. John De Witt, D.D.,	New Brunswick, N.J.
Prof. Timothy Dwight, D.D.,	New Haven, Conn.
Prof. Ll. I. Evans, D.D.,	Lane Theol. Sem., Cincinnati, O.
Prof. Henry Ferguson,	Hartford, Conn.
Prof. G. P. Fisher, D.D., LL.D.,	New Haven, Conn.
Prof. Frederic Gardiner, D.D.,	Middletown, Conn.
Prof. F. A. Gast, D.D.,	Lancaster, Penn.
Prof. J. F. Genung, Ph.D.,	Amherst, Mass.
Rev. C. R. Gillett,	Union Theol. Sem., New York, N.Y.
Prof. D. R. Goodwin, D.D., LL.D.,	3927 Locust St., Philadelphia, Penn.
Prof. E. P. Gould,	34 North Ave., Cambridge, Mass.
Prof. Isaac H. Hall, Ph.D.,	725 Chestnut St., Philadelphia, Penn.
Prof. W. R. Harper, Ph.D.,	Morgan Park (near Chicago), Ill.
Prof. Samuel Hart,	Hartford, Conn.
Prof. C. D. Hartranft, D.D.,	Box 524, Hartford, Conn.
Rev. E. Harwood, D.D.,	New Haven, Conn.
Rev. F. A. Henry,	Ridgefield, Conn.
Rev. F. G. Hibbard, D.D.,	Clifton Springs, N.Y.
Prof. E. Y. Hincks,	Andover, Mass.
Prof. R. D. Hitchcock, D.D., LL.D.,	Union Theol. Sem., New York, N.Y.
Prof. A. B. Hyde, D.D.,	Meadville, Penn.
Rev. S. M. Jackson,	14 East 31st St., New York, N.Y.
Rev. E. H. Jewett, D.D.,	Norwich, Conn.
Prof. G. T. Ladd, D.D.,	New Haven, Conn.
Prof. J. W. Lindsay, D.D.,	West Newton, Mass.
Prof. D. G. Lyon, Ph.D.,	Lowell St., Cambridge, Mass.
Rev. J. J. McCook,	Hartford, Conn.
Rev. C. M. Mead, Ph.D.,	Leipzig, Germany.
Rev. Selah Merrill, D.D.,	Jerusalem, Syria.
Rev. R. W. Micou,	Waterbury, Conn.
Prof. H. G. Mitchell, Ph.D.,	12 Somerset St., Boston, Mass.
Rev. J. I. Mombert, D.D.,	Paterson, N.J.

- Prof. G. F. Moore,
 Rev. P. A. Nordell,
 Prof. Howard Osgood, D.D.,
 Prof. J. A. Paine, Ph.D.,
 Rev. J. P. Peters, Ph.D.,
 Rev. Bernhard Pick, Ph.D.,
 Prof. George Prentice, D.D.,
 Rev. Edwin W. Rice,
 Prof. T. H. Rich,
 Prof. M. B. Riddle, D.D.,
 Rev. J. F. Riggs,
 Prof. C. J. H. Ropes,
 Prof. Philip Schaff, D.D., LL.D.,
 Prof. G. H. Schodde, Ph.D.,
 Prof. H. M. Scott,
 Prof. Charles Short, LL.D.,
 Prof. H. P. Smith,
 Rev. Newman Smyth, D.D.,
 Prof. O. S. Stearns, D.D.,
 Rev. R. P. Stebbins, D.D.,
 Rev. Daniel Steele, D.D.,
 Prof. P. H. Steenstra, D.D.,
 Prof. W. A. Stevens, D.D., LL.D.,
 Rev. Jacob Streibert,
 Prof. James Strong, D.D., LL.D.,
 Prof. J. P. Taylor,
 Rev. W. M. Taylor, D.D., LL.D.,
 Rev. M. S. Terry, D.D.,
 Prof. J. H. Thayer, D.D.,
 Rev. J. E. Todd, D.D.,
 Prof. C. H. Toy, D.D., LL.D.,
 Rev. M. R. Vincent, D.D.,
 Rev. W. H. Ward, D.D.,
 Prof. B. B. Warfield, D.D.,
 Prof. R. F. Weidner,
 Prof. H. G. Weston, D.D.,
 Andover, Mass.
 New London, Conn.
 Rochester, N.Y.
 Tarrytown, N.Y.
 Cor. 99th St. & 10th Ave., New York,
 N.Y.
 Allegheny, Penn.
 Middletown, Conn.
 1122 Chestnut St., Philadelphia, Penn.
 Lewiston, Me.
 Hartford, Conn.
 Cranford, N.J.
 Bangor, Me.
 42 Bible House, New York, N.Y.
 Columbus, O.
 248 Washington Boulevard, Chicago,
 Ill.
 24 West 60th St., New York, N.Y.
 Lane Theol. Sem., Cincinnati, O.
 New Haven, Conn.
 Newton Centre, Mass.
 Newton Centre, Mass.
 Reading, Mass.
 Cambridge, Mass.
 Rochester, N.Y.
 West Haven, Conn.
 Madison, N.J.
 Andover, Mass.
 5 West 35th St., New York, N.Y.
 249 West 43d St., New York, N.Y.
 Cambridge, Mass.
 New Haven, Conn.
 Lowell St., Cambridge, Mass.
 37 East 35th St., New York, N.Y.
 Office of *The Independent*, New York,
 N.Y.
 Allegheny, Penn.
 Rock Island, Ill.
 Chester, Penn.

1

JOURNAL OF THE SOCIETY
OF
BIBLICAL LITERATURE
AND
EXEGESIS,
CONTAINING
PAPERS AND PROCEEDINGS
FOR
JUNE AND DECEMBER, 1884.

*The authors alone are responsible for the contents
of their papers.*

PUBLISHED FOR THE SOCIETY
BY THE SECRETARY, H. G. MITCHELL,
12 SOMERSET ST., BOSTON, MASS.

Price to Subscribers, \$3.00.

CONTENTS.

Papers.

	PAGE.
THE LITERARY FORM OF THE BIBLICAL HISTORY OF THE JUDGES .	3
PROF. WILLIS J. BEECHER, D.D.	
THE RIGHTEOUSNESS WHICH IS OF FAITH	29
PROF. J. F. GENUNG, PH.D.	
A SYRIAC MANUSCRIPT WITH THE ANTILEGOMENA EPISTLES . .	37
PROF. I. H. HALL, PH.D.	
THE DATE OF THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS	50
PROF. B. B. WARFIELD, D.D.	
SERVANT OF JEHOVAH	65
REV. R. P. STEBBINS, D.D.	
THE DATE OF THE KORAH-PSALMS	80
PROF. C. H. TOY, D.D., LL.D.	
EMENDATIONS AND CORRECTIONS	93
REV. J. I. MOMBERT, D.D.	
PHILO'S CANON OF THE OLD TESTAMENT AND HIS MODE OF QUOTING THE ALEXANDRIAN VERSION	126
REV. B. PICK, PH.D.	
NOTES	144
<i>The Idea of Atonement, as found in the Piel verb כִּפֵּר,</i> <i>the nouns כִּפָּרִים and כִּפְּרֶת, etc.—John iii. 8.—</i> <i>Some Typographical Errors in the Revised Version.—</i> <i>Mִי interrogative.</i>	
PROCEEDINGS	150
OFFICERS	157
LIST OF MEMBERS	157

PAPERS.

The Literary Form of the Biblical History of the Judges.¹

BY PROF. WILLIS J. BEECHER, D.D.

FROM the point where David first appears, in the account of Samuel's anointing him for king, 1 Sam. xvi., the books of Samuel might fairly be entitled *The Personal and Public History of King David*. The previous chapters of Samuel, with the books of Ruth and of Judges, would bear well the descriptive title: *The History of Israel from the Death of Joshua to the Anointing of David*. The reign of Saul is transitional. In the history as it is written, this reign hardly comes to the front at all. It is rather an affair which attended the close of the period of the Judges, and the opening years of David's career, than an independent historical fact. The history of the Judges, as recorded in the Bible, extends up to the time of the anointing of David.

It is not intended by this that the written history itself shows any formal division at this line. That is not the case. The history, as a literary production, passes continuously from the times of the Judges to those of David. But the division of its contents sufficiently justifies the limitation proposed for the present paper. Our inquiry is concerning the literary form of the account of the times from the death of Joshua to the anointing of David, as found in the present books of Judges, Ruth, and Samuel.

I. First, what are the parts of which it is composed?

The book of Ruth, in its present literary form, is evidently a complete historical story by itself. Some of the marks of this character are the following:

1. It stands by itself chronologically. It is not a continuation of anything which precedes it, and is not continued in anything which

¹ Read in June, 1884.

follows it. This is equally true whether we think of it in the place which it occupies in our English Bibles, between Judges and Samuel, or in the different places among the Hagiographa assigned to it in the various catalogues, or in the Hebrew Bibles.

2. It comes to a complete close. Any one may see that, having summed up the genealogy of David, in the fourth chapter, the story is at an end.

3. It begins with a certain formula, appropriate for beginning historical stories, —a formula which briefly introduces to us the personages of the story, with their family relations to one another, and their surroundings. This formula, given in full, would include the following seven particulars :

During a certain period in history,
there was a certain man,
of certain lineage,
from a certain locality,
bearing a certain name,
having certain relatives, or connections,
who bore certain names.

This formula appears in the opening of the book of Ruth, in the following words: "And it was in the days when the Judges ruled, and there was a famine in the land. And there went a man from Bethlehem Judah, to sojourn in the fields of Moab, he and his wife and his two sons; the name of the man being Elimelech, and the name of his wife Naomi, and the name of his two sons Mahlon and Chilion, Ephrathites from Bethlehem Judah." In this case, instead of saying formally that there was such a man, the interests of variety and of brevity are subserved by placing in the introductory formula the statement that he went to sojourn in Moab.

4. The interest of the story centres rather in the private experiences of the persons mentioned in it than in public affairs; marriage-love and motherhood being prominent among the items which give it interest.

5. The story is a unit, having a single subject, with progress from beginning to end.

6. If it were dropped, it would not be missed. What precedes it joins with what follows, as well without it as with it; perhaps better. This is entirely consistent with the fact that it throws light on all the other historical documents pertaining to the times.

7. It begins with *Waw* consecutive of the imperfect, and not with

weak Waw followed by the subject of the first verb ; showing that the author thinks of it as one of a series of narratives, and not as an episode in some longer narrative. Expressing this reason in untechnical English, the author here begins by saying : "And it came to pass," as if he had finished one story, and were now going to tell another ; instead of beginning with : "Now it came to pass," as if he had temporarily dropped the main thread of his narrative, in order to bring in other matter incidentally bearing upon it.

No one doubts the conclusiveness of these tests as applied to the book of Ruth. The same tests are equally conclusive in proving that the last three chapters of Judges constitute another detached historical narrative ; a narrative which might be entitled : The Story of the Benjamite Civil War. Equally with the book of Ruth, this story is out of chronological relation with its context ; brings itself to a formal close ; begins with the story teller's formula, saying that, at a certain time, namely, in the days when there was no king in Israel, there was a certain man, of certain lineage, to wit, a Levite, from a certain locality, that is to say, the sides of Mount Ephraim, having certain connections, namely, a concubine and her father,—their names being, in this case, omitted ; depends for its interest largely on marriage-love, and other private experiences, even while it deals with stirring public events ; displays unity of subject ; would not be missed from its place, if it were dropped, though some of the other history might become unintelligible for lack of it ; begins with Waw consecutive of the imperfect.

In Judges xvii., xviii., we have another complete narration. We might call it : The Story of the Danite Expedition. Like the stories of Ruth and of the Benjamite War, it is chronologically detached. Like them, it begins with the conventional formula : "And there was a man from the mountain country of Ephraim, his name being Micah, and he said to his mother, The 1100 of silver of thine, which was taken, about which thou cursedst, &c. . . . I took it." Three of the seven points of the formula are, indeed, omitted ; namely, the date, the man's ancestry, and his mother's name. But the date "when there was no king in Israel" is given in xvii. 6 and in xviii. 1 ; and the formula is none the less real for its being unusually abbreviated. The private experiences of Micah, his mother, and his priest, are relied upon to give interest to the narrative. The narrative is itself a unit. While it throws light upon other parts of the history, it might be dropped from its context without being in the least missed. It begins with Waw consecutive of the imperfect.

Thus far we have been traversing ground which has often been traversed, and arguing conclusions which no one would dispute. It was desirable to argue them, however, so as to see upon precisely what basis they rest, for the purpose of showing that certain other things rest on a basis precisely similar. That the account of Samson and his exploits, beginning with the thirteenth chapter of Judges, the second verse, and extending to the close of the sixteenth chapter, is another of these separate historical stories, is a fact which has not been so generally recognized as it ought to have been. The group of narratives concerning Samson are out of chronological order. They are followed by the account of the Danite expedition, which certainly took place before Samson's time, and are preceded by the sketches of Jephthah, Ibzan, Elon, and Abdon, all of whom flourished later than Samson.¹ The stories concerning Samson come

¹ This last assertion would not, at present, be generally accepted without proof, since it is quite common to regard Samson as the contemporary of Eli. As to the proof of it, the following points may be noted:

1. The proof is not necessary for the purposes of the present paper. If we waive the matter, we yet have, in the other points we consider, evidence enough for our purpose. We might fairly thus waive it, and, having made out our general proposition, infer the date of the events connected with Samson from that proposition.

2. A general consideration of the numerals in the book of Judges, and the chronology they exhibit, would be to the purpose, but cannot be given here.

3. Outside the accounts concerning Samson, three separate Philistine oppressions are mentioned in the book of Judges. The first was in the days of Deborah, Barak, and Jael. Shamgar was the deliverer from it. It is mentioned in Jud. iii. 31: "And after him," that is, after Ehud, "was Shamgar the son of Anath; and he smote the Philistines, six hundred men, with the ox-goad; and he also was one who saved Israel." It is again alluded to in the song of Deborah, Jud. v. 6-8:

"In the days of Shamgar the son of Anath,
In the days of Jael, roads ceased,
While travelers got to going in by-paths;
Government ceased in Israel, ceased,
Until that I Deborah arose,
That I arose, a mother in Israel.
They began to choose new Gods.
Then there was war at the gates!
If there was a shield seen or a spear,
Among forty thousand in Israel!"

This language pretty distinctly implies that the Philistine invasion of the days of Shamgar was contemporaneous with the invasion of Jabin and Sisera. This

to a complete close, at the end of the sixteenth chapter. They begin with the formal opening: "And there was a certain man, from Zorah, from the family of the Danite, his name being Manoah, and his wife being barren," &c. The name of his wife and the date are omitted. The remaining five points in the formula distinctly appear. The personal experiences of Manoah and his wife, her motherhood,

is perhaps confirmed by the fact that it affords a natural explanation of the absence of Judah from Deborah's roll-call of the tribes,—namely, that Judah was invaded by the Philistines, and had enough to do at home.

This same oppression, with the deliverance from it, is again mentioned, by way of reminiscence, in connection with the mention of the second Philistine oppression, in Jud. x. 11: "Did not (I save you) from Egypt and from the Amorite, from the sons of Ammon and from the Philistines? And the Sidonians and Amalek and Maon having crowded you, ye cried unto me and I saved you from their hand." The list includes the deliverance from *Egypt* under Moses, from the *Amorite* under Joshua, that under Ehud, from Eglon king of Moab, who had "gathered unto him the *sons of Ammon* and Amalek, and went and smote Israel" (Jud. iii. 13), that from the *Philistines* under Shamgar, that from the *Sidonians* under Deborah, and that from *Amalek* and *Maon* and Midian (see Jud. vi. 3, 33) under Gideon. That the deliverance from the Philistines is that under Shamgar is apparent from the other names mentioned in the list, and the order in which they are mentioned.

Not long after this first Philistine oppression, and the deliverance under Shamgar, the Philistines themselves, in common with Israel, suffered from the Midianite and Amalekite invasion, whose destructive operations extended "till thou come unto Gaza," Jud. vi. 4. The deliverance under Gideon was for Philistia, as well as for Israel. The forty years of Gideon were followed by the three years of Abimelech, the twenty-three of Tola, and the twenty-two of Jair. Then comes an account of a second Philistine oppression, Jud. x. 7: "And the anger of Jehovah was kindled with Israel, and he sold them into the hand of the Philistines and into the hand of the sons of Ammon." Then, without any details as to the Philistine oppression thus mentioned, there is given an account of the eighteen years of the Ammonite oppression, with the deliverance under Jephthah. Then follow, in close succession, the sketches of the administrations of Jephthah, Ibzan, Elon, and Abdon, covering thirty-one years in all, and then, in Jud. xiii. 1, an account of a third Philistine oppression: "And the sons of Israel again did the evil in the eyes of Jehovah, and Jehovah gave them into the hand of the Philistines forty years." A fourth oppression, more deplorable than all the preceding ones, is mentioned in 1 Sam. xiii., as having occurred in the days of Saul, after the first rupture between Saul and Samuel.

There is no room for doubt that this is what these writings say. That it presents a view of the matter essentially different from the view taken by many scholars, must be admitted. But for the present, following what the writings say, not raising the question whether they say what they mean, or whether what they say is true, it is evident that they mention these four distinct oppressions.

Evidently, it was during the third, if any, of these oppressions that the ark

the personal exploits of Samson, and his loves, are the topics here presented, almost to the exclusion of even the important public affairs in which he was concerned. These constitute the one theme of the group of stories, and though the unity is more complex than in the previous instances, it is not less real, and is marked by steady pro-

was captured and the other incidents related in the first chapters of 1 Samuel took place. From this oppression there was a signal deliverance, while Samuel was judge; so signal that the Philistines made no more attacks till after the close of the separate administration of Samuel, 1 Sam. vii. 13.

Now with which, if any, of these four oppressions, are we to connect the exploits of Samson? It is natural to connect them with one of the four, unless something in the evidence positively forbids. It is now fashionable to connect them with the third of the four, and therefore with the times of Eli. But if Samson was contemporary with Eli, Israel had then two chief magistrates, with their headquarters in the same vicinity. This is indeed not impossible, but it is very improbable. If Samson was contemporary with Eli, he effected no deliverance for Israel; for at the time of Eli's death, the people were still in servitude to the Philistines, and had long been so, 1 Sam. iv. 9. But the implication in the story of Samson is very decided to the effect that he accomplished a great deliverance for Israel. It was divinely promised concerning him, Jud. xiii. 5: "Because the boy shall be a Nazarite of God from the womb, he being the one who shall commence to save Israel from the hand of the Philistines." From Jud. xiv. 4 and onward, Samson's occasions and exploits against the Philistines are mentioned as part of the Lord's plan for accomplishing the promised deliverance. In Jud. xvi. 30, the expression, "And the dead whom he slew in his death were more than those whom he slew in his life," certainly does not convey the impression that the deliverance promised through him had proved a failure. We have hardly any details as to the condition of Israel during the twenty years when Samson was judge. But when Samson's exploits began, the Philistines asserted their dominion over Israel, in demanding his arrest. When they finally got possession of his person, near the close of his career, it was by fraud, and on an occasion when he had voluntarily placed himself within their territory. This looks as if they no longer had dominion over Israel. It seems, therefore, to be the meaning of the historian, that God accomplished through Samson the deliverance which he promised. But certainly no such deliverance occurred in the times of Eli. If there were positive proof that Eli and Samson were contemporaneous, there are possible explanations which might meet this difficulty; but they are forced and improbable, and there is no such proof. Moreover, the coloring of the accounts of the times of Samson is utterly different from that of the times of Eli. This is easily accounted for, if an interval of time had elapsed, but is otherwise more difficult to account for. In the times of Samson, as in the times of the Danite expedition, the curious numeral 1100 plays its part in the counting of silver. It was 1100 of silver that Micah's mother had lost, and 1100 of silver that each Philistine lord was to pay to Delilah, Jud. xvi. 5, xvii. 3. And in many other particulars, the times of Samson are more like the earlier times in the period of the Judges than the later.

gress from beginning to end. As in the other cases, if the story of Samson were removed to some other part of the Scriptures, its removal would leave no blank in the context where it now stands. And this story, like the others, begins with Waw consecutive of the imperfect.

Another story of the same sort is that of The Childhood and Training of Samuel, beginning with the book of 1 Samuel and extending to the middle of the first verse of the fourth chapter. This story begins with Waw consecutive of the imperfect. Its introductory formula is very complete, omitting nothing but the date: "And there was a certain man, from Ramathaim Zophim, from Mount Ephraim, his name being Elkanah, the son of Jeroham, the son of Elihu the son of Tohu the son of Zuph, an Ephrathite; and he had two wives, the name of the one Hannah, and the name of the second Peninnah." The story deals with very important public affairs, but its interest chiefly centres within the households of Elkanah and Eli, and in the personal experiences of the boy Samuel and his mother. It is a progressive unity, though diverse materials are woven into it. If it were separated from its present context, it would leave the continuity unbroken. It comes to a worthy and unmistakable close in the words: "And Samuel became great, Jehovah being with him, and letting none of all his words fall to the earth; and all Israel knew, from Dan and even to Beersheba. For Samuel was confirmed for a prophet of Jehovah's; and Jehovah again appeared in Shiloh, for Jehovah was revealed unto Samuel in Shiloh in the word of Jehovah; and Samuel's word was to all Israel."¹

In its chronological relations, however, and in some peculiarities at

We avoid all these difficulties if we connect the exploits of Samson with the second of the four Philistine oppressions. And when we try the experiment of thus connecting them, we find that it gives us an order of events, and a succession of dates, so clear, simple, and every way probable, as to afford strong probability that this is the true adjustment.

If this view be correct, the story of the exploits of Samson is out of chronological connection at the beginning of it, as well as at its close.

¹ The chapter and verse divisions, as they now exist, obscure this passage extremely. There can be no doubt, I think, that the translation and the construction here given are the true ones. The words "Jehovah again appeared in Shiloh," are antithetical to the statement, iii. 1, "Now the word of Jehovah was precious in those days, there was no open vision." The idea is that there had once been a time when Jehovah was gloriously manifested in Shiloh. For a considerable period before Samuel, this manifestation had nearly ceased. As Samuel came into the exercise of his gifts, it was restored.

its close, this story is somewhat different from the others. Like them, it has nothing directly to do, chronologically, with what precedes it; but it is probably in immediate chronological connection with what follows. It is separated from what follows, however, by the construction. What immediately follows is part of the public history of the nation, and not a continuation of the narrative respecting Samuel. If, therefore, it were a portion of the same discourse, we should expect it to begin with the weak Waw and the subject; but it begins, instead, with Waw consecutive of the imperfect. In other words, instead of taking up this fresh topic as a new thread of discourse, with a: "Now Israel went forth to meet the Philistines," it introduces the topic as if it were either a simple continuation of the previous discourse (which it is not), or else a new discourse in the series (which it therefore is): "*And* Israel went forth."

The chronological connection, apparently, accounts for the fact that the points in the other history which are elucidated by this story are in the context immediately following it. By reading the story first, we better understand what the following account says of Eli, Hophni, Phinehas, and the like; although even without the explanations given in the story, we should easily grasp the following narrative. In this, the present story differs from the four stories previously mentioned, since the passages they elucidate are quite widely separated from the story, instead of being found in its immediate context.

This increases, however, instead of diminishing, the force of the point that the present story, like all the others, might be removed from its connection without destroying the unity of the context. At this juncture, the consideration becomes more cogent than it has hitherto been. We have found it to be true of each of the five stories in detail. As the five succeed each other with no intervals, it is also true of them all together. Try the experiment. Begin a few verses before the close of the twelfth chapter of Judges, read through the first verse of the thirteenth chapter, and then from the middle of the first verse of the fourth chapter of 1 Samuel, and you will find that there is no break, but that, on the contrary, the true order of the history, which had previously been concealed, is made clearly to appear. Beginning with the close of the somewhat full account of Jephthah's career, the narrative is as follows:

"And Jephthah judged Israel six years, and Jephthah the Gileadite died, and was buried in the cities of Gilead. And after him Ibzan of Bethlehem judged Israel. And he had thirty sons, and thirty daughters he sent abroad, and brought in thirty daughters for his sons from abroad, and he judged Israel seven years.

And Ibzan died and was buried in Bethlehem. And after him Elon the Zebulonite judged Israel, and judged Israel ten years. And Elon the Zebulonite died and was buried in Ajalon in the land of Zebulun. And after him Abdon the son of Hillel the Pirathonite judged Israel. And he had forty sons and thirty grandsons, riding upon seventy asses, and he judged Israel eight years. And Abdon the son of Hillel the Pirathonite died, and was buried in Pirathon in the land of Ephraim, in the mountain of the Amalekite. And the sons of Israel again did the evil in the eyes of Jehovah, and Jehovah gave them into the hand of the Philistines forty years. And Israel went forth to meet the Philistines for the battle, and encamped upon the Ebenezer, the Philistines being encamped in Aphek. And the Philistines drew out to meet Israel, and the battle was joined, and Israel was defeated before the Philistines," &c.

There is evidently here no break in the verbal continuity of the account. If the five stories were all removed, as the story of Ruth has been, to some other part of the Bible, they would leave the history of the times of the Judges, to all appearance, compact and unbroken. Indeed, it is not till we thus drop the five stories that the account assumes, for the first time, the semblance of a continuous narrative. When we drop them, it becomes evident that the succession of dates in the twelfth chapter of Judges brings the history up to the time of Eli; and that the forty years of the Philistine oppression mentioned in Jud. xiii. 1 are probably the forty years during which Eli judged Israel.

There is one more of these stories. The story of The Anointing of Saul, 1 Sam. ix. and x. 1-16, is indeed in its proper chronological place, and is so far on a different footing from the five. In its conclusion it is not so sharply separated as are the others from what follows. But it begins a new topic, not continuous with what precedes, and introduced, not by the weak Waw with the subject, which would introduce an episode, but by the Waw consecutive of the imperfect, which introduces an independent narrative. It opens with the conventional formula, the date, indeed, being omitted, but the other six points being expressed: "And there was a man from Benjamin, his name being Kish, the son of Abiel, the son of Zeror, the son of Becorath the son of Aphiah, the son of a man of Jemini, a mighty man of power. And he had a son, his name being Saul," &c. The interest of the story centres in the private experiences of Saul and his friends, though it is not, like the others, a story of love and motherhood. The story is a unit, having a single subject, with progress throughout. If it were removed, it would leave no gap in the narrative. There is no more room for doubt as to its character than in the previous instances.

Having thus differentiated these six historical stories from the nar-

natives of public history in which they are imbedded, we shall be able rapidly to complete our analysis of this portion of the literature. In 1 Samuel, from the middle of the first verse of the fourth chapter to the close of the fifteenth chapter and onward, we have a continuous narrative of public history, made up of a series of shorter narratives arranged mainly in the order of time, and connected by Waw consecutive with the imperfect tense. Into the middle of one of these shorter narratives — not between two of them — is inserted the sixth of the historical stories mentioned above, the story of Saul's search for the asses, and his being anointed king. These narratives describe to us the culmination of the Philistine conquest, when the ark was taken, the supernatural rescue of the ark, the winning of Israel's independence under Samuel, with a sketch of his administration, the proceedings by which Saul was made king, the war against Nahash the Ammonite, the confirming of the kingdom, the renewed and complete subjection to the Philistines and the deliverance from it, a general sketch of Saul's reign, and the war against Amalek. They close with Samuel's retirement from active public life, after he had finally broken with Saul.

Turning back to Jud. ii. 6, we read :

"And Joshua sent away the people, and the sons of Israel went each to his inheritance to possess the land. And the people served Jehovah all the days of Joshua, and all the days of the elders who prolonged their days after Joshua, who saw all the great deed of Jehovah which he did for Israel. And Joshua the son of Nun, the servant of Jehovah, died, at a hundred and ten years of age ; and they buried him in the border of his inheritance in Timnath Heres, in the mountain country of Ephraim, north of Gaash. And all that generation being also gathered to their fathers, there arose another generation after them, who knew not Jehovah, nor yet the deed which he did for Israel."

These verses are mainly repeated from the closing sentences of the book of Joshua, with slight changes of words and order. It is clear that the continuous portion of the history in the Judges begins at this point. A perusal of it will show that it proceeds with perfect continuity to the point where the story of Samson and his exploits begins ; that is, to the close of the first verse of the thirteenth chapter. The matters which precede the sixth verse of the second chapter are evidently prefatory, and are quite miscellaneous.

This body of writings, therefore, recounting the history of the times of the Judges, divides itself clearly into four parts :

1. First, we have certain prefatory statements, contained in what is now the first chapter of Judges and the first five verses of the sec-

ond chapter. A considerable proportion of these statements are identical, both in their contents and in their phraseology, with matters found in various parts of the book of Joshua. They bear marks of being statements which had been omitted from the following parts of the history, but which, being counted worthy of preservation, and having some connection with this history, were subsequently prefixed to it. They seem, therefore, to have been written later than the connected history which directly follows. To them we will henceforth apply the descriptive term, *The Preface*.

2. Secondly, beginning with the sixth verse of the second chapter of Judges, and closing with the close of the first verse of the thirteenth chapter, we have a continuous narrative of the period from the death of Joshua to the administration of Eli. To distinguish this from the other parts, we will call it *The Public History of the Judges*.

3. Thirdly, we have the six historical stories, namely :

1st, The story of Samson and his Exploits, Jud. xiii. 2-xvi.

2d, That of the Danite Expedition, Jud. xvii., xviii.

3d, That of the Benjamite Civil War, Jud. xix., xx., xxi.

4th, That of Ruth, Ruth i.-iv.

5th, That of the Childhood of Samuel, 1 Sam. i.-iii. and iv. 1a.

6th, That of the Anointing of Saul, 1 Sam. ix. and x. 1-16.

4. Fourthly, we have eight or more consecutive narrations, beginning with the middle of the first verse of the fourth chapter of 1 Sam., and extending to the close of the fifteenth chapter ; giving the history from the death of Eli, which resulted in rendering Samuel especially conspicuous, to the retirement of Samuel from active public life, after the Amalekite war. We will entitle this *The Public History of Samuel and Saul*. The historical story of the Anointing of Saul is inserted in the middle of the fourth of these eight narrations.

II. If our analysis is correct, it ought to assist us in understanding the various critical questions which arise, in connection with these parts of the Scriptures. And the application of the analysis to this use ought to be the best possible test of the analysis itself ; either confirming or disproving it as the case may be. Let us now apply it, therefore, in a few selected problems, among the many in which it is capable of being applied.

(1) We inquire, first, into the relative order in which the parts we have distinguished were written.

The second of the four parts, that which we have called *The Public History of the Judges*, differs from all the rest, in offering a full scheme of chronology for the times concerning which it treats. For

the first portion of the history, extending to the death of Gideon, it gives us a succession of five periods of forty years each, and gives also various other chronological numerals. After that, it has a system of dates by the succession and the years of the Judges.¹

In the Public History of Samuel and Saul, on the contrary, the dates are very meagre; and in all the historical stories, the twenty years of the administration of Samson is the only numeral which is important to the chronology of the period. But, beginning with the reign of David, the books of Samuel give complete dates. The books of Kings do the same, for the periods they cover. So do the books of Chronicles and Ezra and Nehemiah. Apparently this custom was never dropped, in this line of historical writings, after it was once introduced. It seems to follow that the Public History of the Judges, as a literary work, is connected with the continuous history of the times of David, while the Public History of Samuel and Saul, with most or all the six historical stories, belong to an earlier literary period, when less attention was paid to dates.

The Benjamite war, as described in the historical story, finds its chronological place in the continuous history, during the eighty years connected with the name of Ehud, the chronological place of the Danite expedition being directly before it.²

Since the events described in these stories and in the story of Samson thus belong within the scope of the continuous history, and are, some of them, exceedingly important public events, it is quite noticeable that the continuous narrative does not mention Samson nor the Danite expedition nor the Benjamite war. It will account for this to say that the stories were written before the other, and that the writer of the continuous history omitted the events, of which they treat,

¹ See *The Chronology of the Period of the Judges*, in the "Old Testament Student," Jan., 1884.

² The account of the deliverance under Ehud closes with the words: "And the land had rest eighty years." Jud. iii. 30.

That the Danite expedition preceded the Benjamite war appears from the use of the expression "From Dan and unto Beer Sheba," Jud. xx. 1, in the narrative of the war. That the Danite expedition preceded the times of Samson appears from the fact that it gave rise to the proper name Mahaneh-Dan, Jud. xviii. 12, and that it was "In Mahaneh-Dan, between Zorah and Eshtaol," that the Spirit of Jehovah began to come upon Samson, Jud. xiii. 25. That both the Danite expedition and the civil war were earlier than the times of Deborah and Shamgar may account for the fact that Benjamin seems to be counted in Deborah's muster-roll, "with the peoples" of Ephraim, Jud. v. 14 and v. 6; this being the natural result of the rape at Shiloh, Jud. xxi. 19-23, for two or three generations after

because he intended to append them, as we now find them appended, to his narrative. On the face of it, therefore, it seems probable that the part of this literature first written was the earlier narratives of the series now beginning with the Public History of Samuel and Saul; that some or all of the historical stories were next written; that these were followed by the Public History of the Judges, written to fill up the gap which still remained in the history; the Preface having been added yet later. That such was the actual order of date in these compositions is at least sufficiently probable to justify us in using it as a working hypothesis in pursuing our investigation.

(2) Again, we look, though but cursorily, for the sources whence these productions drew their historical materials.

For facts contemporaneous with the writings themselves, we have no need to suppose any source other than current knowledge or opinion. For older facts, oral tradition might supposably be a sufficient source. So far as we find no older sources, there is no objection to regarding the several narratives as strictly pieces of original composition. But there is no difficulty in tracing a considerable portion of them to older sources.

These authors made abundant use of the historical monuments which existed in the shape of proper names of places, persons, and clans. "The man went into the land of the Hittites, and built . . . Luz, which is the name thereof unto this day," Jud. i. 26. The fact that, in the Hittite country, there existed this city, in the days of the author, and the tradition as to how it came to exist, were to him sources of historical information. This is characteristic of these writings throughout. "They called the name of that place Bochim," Jud. ii. 5. The name of Heber the Kenite, in northern Israel, becomes significant for his purpose, in Jud. iv. and v. So are

that rape. To prove this is to prove that these events occurred during the eighty years connected with Ehud. But there is independent proof of the same in the statement, Jud. xx. 28, that "Phinehas the son of Eleazar the son of Aaron was standing before" the Ark "in those days." This Phinehas was already a warrior before the death of Moses, Num. xxv. 7, 11. If he lived through the first forty-year period, which included the conquest under Joshua and the deliverance by Othniel, Jud. iii. 11, and then lived to the middle of the succeeding eighty years, he reached an extreme old age. On this interpretation, the expression "The land had rest forty years" must mean, of course, had rest to the end of the forty-year period then current, and must also refer to rest from foreign subjugation only, and not to rest from civil war. But as this is probably the case on any possible interpretation of the record, it cannot be regarded as a serious objection to this particular interpretation.

the names of Jerubbaal, vi. 32 ; "Havvoth-Jair unto this day," x. 4 ; Ramath-Lehi and "En-Hakkore which is in Lehi unto this day," xv. 17, 19 ; "Mahaneh-Dan unto this day," xviii. 12 ; "The great Abel . . . unto this day in the field of Joshua the Beth-Shemite," i Sam. vi. 18.¹

The historian who wrote these pages was evidently a diligent student of the phenomena presented by proper names, and of the historical facts in which these phenomena originated. He was an equally diligent student of the similar phenomena presented by either existing or archaic usages of speech or customs of living. The fact, for example, that Saul, in inquiring for Samuel, i Sam. ix. 9, used the word *seer*, instead of the word *prophet*, did not escape him, or seem to him an insignificant fact. What it signified we need not now take time to ascertain. Other similar instances are : "Therefore neither the priests of Dagon, nor any that come into Dagon's house, tread on the threshold of Dagon in Ashdod unto this day," i Sam. v. 5 ; "In former time in Israel concerning redeeming and concerning changing . . . a man plucked off his shoe and gave it to his neighbor," Ruth iv. 7. This historian was not slow to notice how the customs of his own time or the different customs of former times might throw light upon his narrative, whether through the fact that his narrative explained the origin of the custom, or in some other way.²

Again, this historian — or these historians — had access to popular songs and ballads, and used these as sources of history. Familiar instances are the song of Hannah, i Sam. ii. 1-10, and the song of Deborah, Jud. v.³ This song of Deborah is the one most distinctly

¹ Similar instances occurring later in the books of Samuel are : "The Beerothites fled to Gittaim, and were sojourners there until this day," 2 Sam. iv. 3 ; "Perez-Uzzah to this day," 2 Sam. vi. 8.

² An instance found further on in Samuel is : "As his part that goeth down to the battle, so his part that tarrieth by the stuff . . . he made it a statute . . . for Israel unto this day." i Sam. xxx. 25.

³ Parallel to these, later in these books, are the two poems attributed to David, 2 Sam. xxii. and xxiii. 1-7, the lament of David for Abner, 2 Sam. iii. 33, 34, and the lament of David over Saul and Jonathan, 2 Sam. i. 17-27. The last is said to be from the book of Jasher. We do not know whether any of the others are from the same source. Nor do we know much as to the extent or the character of this collection of poetry. If the book of Joshua was written early, then the book of Jasher must have been a collection perpetuated from generation to generation, since it is cited in Jos. x. 13.

It might not be easy, in all cases, to determine whether the poems in question

used as a source of historical information. In writing the account in chapter iv. the historian evidently had the song in his mind. His account is little else than an explanation of the circumstances mentioned in the song which seem to him to need explanation. Then, instead of repeating the remaining circumstances mentioned in the song, he transcribes the song itself as a portion of his narrative. In none of the other instances does the history seem to be greatly indebted to songs which it inserts, so far as the furnishing of matters of fact is concerned.

Other sources, traceable in these documents, are official decisions, couched in official language, not improbably copied from written official documents. For example, we are told in Jud. xxi. 12 that the twelve thousand men whom the congregation sent to smite Jabesh Gilead, and obtain wives for the remnant of Benjamin, found four hundred young women suitable for the purpose, "and brought them in unto the camp, in Shiloh, which is in the land of Canaan." It is quite customary to explain this by saying that the book of Judges was evidently written at so late a date that the people who were likely to read it did not know that Shiloh was in the land of Canaan, and needed to be told. But manifestly that is a date which never was and never will be. All such explanations are simply absurd. But the phraseology is perfectly explained, if we remember that here is a case in which men would hardly act without a very explicit commission; and then suppose that we have here an extract from the legal phraseology of that commission. A few verses farther on, in connection with the scheme for the authorized abduction of girls enough to supply the rest of the Benjamites with wives, we have the following immensely formal statement: "And they said, 'Behold the festival of Jehovah in Shiloh from year to year, which is from northward to Bethel, from toward the rising of the sun to the highway that goes up from Bethel toward Shechem, and south of Lebonah' (or 'from the South country to Lebanon')." No such verbiage as this was ever adopted by any historian for the sake of explaining anything to some one who did not know. It is rather the language of a legal document, loaded down with words as a protection against quibbling or evasion. And, indeed, the more closely one studies this narrative,

came to the historian as written sources, or as having been orally handed down. The fact that one of them is from the *book* of Jasher may perhaps turn the scale in favor of the opinion that all were written. At all events, if any one affirms that any of them were unwritten, he affirms what is, at strongest, a mere conjecture.

the more it seems to have been drawn from the minutes of the legal proceedings held at the time, and committed to record. The particulars given as to the Levite and his concubine are quite exactly those which would have been elicited in a legal investigation. The woman's character was not very good. On the face of it, it looked as if she and her husband might merely have got into disreputable company at Gibeah, and suffered the natural consequences. The particulars which prove that this was not the case are given as sharply and clearly as if they had been elicited from the witnesses by an ably conducted examination in court.¹

We have to notice one more class of marks of compilation found in some parts of these writings,—marks which show that some of the narratives which, put together, make up the whole history, were themselves formed by joining two or more previously existing written accounts. In the production, for example, which we have called the story of the Exploits of Samson, there are two separate conclusions. The first is: "And he judged Israel in the days of the Philistines twenty years," Jud. xv. 20. The second is: "And he judged Israel twenty years," xvi. 31. Repetitions in a story are not necessarily marks of its having been compiled from previously existing sources; but the repetitions in this case probably are such marks.²

And if these be accepted as evidence at all, they must be accepted as evidence of written sources.

(3) This leads us briefly to notice the fact that the writings we are examining are themselves parts of a larger historical work. The evidence which shows that the parts exist, and especially the evidence cited under (1) above, to show the order in which they were written, also shows that the parts are fitted together, along with the narratives which follow them, so as to constitute a single, and somewhat extensive book of history. This book is doubtless conterminous with our present books of Judges, Ruth, and Samuel, though to argue this proposition would lead us beyond the limits of the present discussion. For present purposes, therefore, we cannot insist upon the extent of the whole of which the writings we are considering are parts, but only upon the fact that there is such a whole.

In (2) above, we have been looking at certain marks which show that some of the writings in hand were produced by processes of

¹ For example, Jud. xix. 4-10 or 10-12.

² So are the repetitions to which attention has often been called in the story of David and Goliath, 1 Sam. xvi., xvii.

compilation from previously existing sources, some of which were written. To this it should be added that, so far as the complete work is concerned, the existence of the parts of it, as we find them, is in itself an exhibition of processes of compilation, by which the whole was formed from these parts.

These phenomena enable us to draw certain conclusions as to the character and relative date of the work in hand, even without first ascertaining its extent.

For example, in view of the use of various historical sources, in the construction of this body of writings, a certain contrast between them and the books of Kings or Chronicles becomes very significant. It is said in 1 Kings xi. 41: "And the rest of the acts of Solomon, and all that he did, and his wisdom, are they not written in the book of the Acts of Solomon?" From this point, this custom of formal reference to the sources of the history is maintained throughout the books of Kings and Chronicles. No such regular custom appears in the writings we have been examining. They contain citations indeed, but not of this formal kind. This contrast is certainly not an accident. We are entitled to infer from it that the producing of the work comprising these writings, in its present form, belongs to a different epoch in history-writing from the producing of the books of the Kings or of the Chronicles, and that an earlier epoch. The same inference is independently justified by the familiar fact that the writings in hand currently speak of the worship on the high places and elsewhere away from the central sanctuary, simply as a fact, without adding those strong phrases of reprobation which are regularly used in the later records. It is further justified by certain contrasts of style and language, since the forms of the later Hebrew appear frequently in Kings, and still more frequently and decidedly in Chronicles, and seldom, if at all, in the writings we are examining. I say "seldom, if at all," in recognition of the fact that phenomena which some critics regard as later forms are confidently explained by others as archaisms.

Since the evidence thus proves that the whole work was produced long before even the earlier of the two great works which treat of the history of Solomon and his successors, it reduces, by this amount, the possible interval that may have occurred between the writing of the constituent parts of the work and the combining of them into the whole which they now form. Again, it is presumable that if much time had elapsed between the production of the parts and that of the whole, we should find traces of this in the differences that would still

exist between the work of the editor and the documents edited ; but such traces, if they exist, are at least indistinct and doubtful. It seems also probable that, if any of the sources of the earlier work were of the nature of extended histories of the period under treatment, these would have been formally cited, just as they are in the later works. Whatever force there is in this consideration is in favor of the idea that the present work is the earliest extended history of Israel in Palestine that was ever written. If this be true, it follows that the documents we have been examining were put together into the whole which they now constitute, not only before the books of Kings were written, but also before the writing of the extended historical works which the books of Kings and Chronicles cite as sources.

In fine, the evidence, so far as examined, indicates the existence of a nearly contemporaneous group of writers, belonging to a pretty early period, who became interested in historical investigations concerning the times of the Judges and the early monarchy, wrote the historical stories and the narratives of public history, and eventually combined the whole into the work as it now stands.

(4) From this we turn naturally to certain indications as to the actual date and authorship of the writings under consideration.

At this point it is, perhaps, well to remind ourselves that we are not considering any of these critical questions completely, on their merits ; but are merely showing how our analysis of the literary form of the writings bears on questions of this sort. The considerations just mentioned, under (3), tend to assign the writings in hand to a quite early date. In addition, the limits of the present paper permit the examination of only a single class of arguments. The various productions which we have found here grouped together seem to display certain *motives* common to the authors, which point out more or less clearly the condition of things which occasioned their being written. For example, the story of Ruth dates the subject of which it treats, verse 1, "in the days when the Judges ruled." It is largely a story of famine, expatriation, misfortune. The stories of the Danite Expedition and the Benjamite War date their subjects "when there was no king in Israel," and every man did what was right in his own eyes ; and this item they make emphatic by frequent repetition, Jud. xvii. 6, xviii. 1, xix. 1, xxi. 25. They, too, picture the times to which they relate as times of great misfortunes, of marauding expeditions, of religious irregularities, times in which property and chastity and life were unprotected, and in which civil war was the horrible remedy

for private aggressions. The other three stories are equally stories of the times of the Judges, that of Saul exhibiting the lack of augustness and magnificence in even the administration of the best judge Israel ever had, and the other two presenting very uninviting pictures of oppression by foreigners and of misgovernment and helplessness at home. The stories indeed bring to light what was admirable and heroic in the times of the Judges; but they make the adverse side stand out with peculiar distinctness. When we notice these facts, one of the motives for the writing of this group of stories becomes evident. There must have been a monarch whose subjects were somewhat discontented, and were grumblingly looking back to the good old days when there was no king in Israel, and every man did as he pleased. And this king must have had one or more wise servants, religious men, patriotic men, men of literary ability, who knew how to write the history of the nation in the form of popular stories which would pass from mouth to mouth among the people, teaching them, along with other and higher lessons, that the good old times were, after all, not so much better than the present.

This phrase is commonly cited as if it were archæological, carrying the date of the events very far back before that of the narrator. But in America, the phrase "the colonial times" was in vogue before the generation of men who fought the revolution and established the republic had ceased to be active. Within fifteen years after the issuing of Abraham Lincoln's proclamation, the negroes at the south had formed the habit of talking about "the times before the wah." It takes only one generation for such forms of speech to become current. Indeed, the men most likely to talk of the days when there was no king in Israel were those whose fathers and grandfathers had seen those days, and had told their boys about them. It was in that particular generation that the reaction was most likely to come, and to need to be met. So far as this item of the evidence is concerned, this is the most natural conclusion as to the date of these stories. They were composed, either in the later years of Saul, or during the reign of David. Next in order, the most natural inference is that some later writer assumed the point of view of these times, for the purpose of writing the stories.

Again, all the six stories except that of Samson are *Ephrathite* stories. The scene of the story of Ruth is Bethlehem Ephratah, Ruth i. 1, 19, 22, iv. 11, &c. The scene of the opening of the story of the Benjamite war is also the same Bethlehem, Jud. xix. 1, 2, 18, &c. In the story of the Danite Expedition, the Levite who became

priest of Micah, and afterward priest at Dan, was from Bethlehem, xvii. 7, 8, 9, &c. In the story of Samuel, 1 Sam. i. 1, we are told that Elkanah was an Ephrathite. There is no reason for trying to understand this to mean Ephraimite, or something else different from its ordinary meaning. Elkanah was likewise a Zuphite of the Zophite Ramathaim, the Arimathea of the New Testament. The Palestinian survey map locates Arimathea close by Bethlehem; and though some would dispute this location, no one would deny that the Zuphite and the Ephrathite tracts of country were either the same or else contiguous. In the story of the Anointing of Saul, Saul finds Samuel in the land of Zuph, 1 Sam. ix. 5, in the neighborhood of Rachel's sepulchre, x. 2, which is itself near Bethlehem, Gen. xxxv. 19, 20. Different as are their themes, the author or authors of these stories have contrived to make them all stories of Bethlehem Ephratah, the birth-place of King David. This cannot be a mere accident. It binds the composing of the stories, somehow, to the person and to the times of David.

Again, both the stories and the other parts of the history firmly assert the primacy of Judah, combining this, however, with a catholic recognition of the claims of the other tribes. In the first part of Ruth, and uniformly in the other stories which name Bethlehem, the place is spoken of as Bethlehem-Judah. The effect of this is at once to emphasize the Judaite location of Bethlehem, and to recognize the existence of the other Bethlehem. In Ruth, Judah is especially made prominent, both in this proper name and in the special mention of Judah in the blessing in iv. 12,¹ no other tribe being similarly specified; but the customs appealed to are those of Israel, and not of the tribe of Judah merely, iv. 7.² And in the blessing pronounced, Rachel, Leah, and Israel are mentioned before Tamar, Pharez, and Judah; and Rachel before Leah, that is, the mother of Ephraim and Manasseh and Benjamin before the mother of Judah. Again, in the account of the Benjamite war, Jehovah directs that Judah shall first go up, Jud. xx. 18; but the war

¹ "And said all the people who were in the gate, the elders being witnesses: Jehovah make the wife who is entering unto thy house as Rachel and as Leah which two did build the house of Israel; . . . and may thy house be like the house of Pharez whom Tamar bore to Judah, of the seed which Jehovah may give to thee from this young woman," Ruth iv. 11, 12.

² "Now this was formerly in Israel, in the matter of redemption or in the matter of exchange, for settling any affair, a man drew off his shoe, and gave it to his neighbor, this being the custom in Israel," Ruth iv. 7.

itself, the convention of the people which directs it, and the exploits performed in it are throughout attributed to all Israel.¹ In precisely similar ways, in the Preface, Judah is recognized as the first of the tribes, and yet the supremacy is vested in Israel, the nation, and not in any of the tribes. For example, in the very first verse of the book, it is the sons of Israel that inquire of Jehovah: "Who shall go up for us, at the outset, against the Canaanite?" The answer they receive is: "Judah shall go up." The same peculiarity appears in all the details of the chapter. Further, in the rest of the history before the time of David, Judah is so little conspicuous in comparison with the other tribes, that these writings are commonly said to have been drawn from the annals of the northern Israelites, to the neglect of those of the southern. Yet in the story of Samson, xv. 11, 13, the men of Judah exercise the prerogative of arresting and handing over to the Philistines a man who did not belong to their tribe, and who, at or about that time, was judge over Israel, xv. 20, xvi. 31. And these accounts further represent that Judah, either from her own citizens or from her resident Levites, furnished the original priest of the Danite sanctuary, Jud. xvii. 7, and the great king-maker, the prophet Samuel himself. Judah's right to the first place is never lost from sight. Yet with all this, every tribe is mentioned, and its exploits recorded. The deeds of some of the tribes are made more prominent than those of Judah. In certain junctures, as for example, the events of the times of Deborah or of Samson, Judah figures rather discredibly.²

¹ "And he laid hold of his concubine, and cut her in pieces, . . . and sent her into every border of Israel. And it came to pass that every one who saw it said: 'There has been nothing . . . like this, even from the day of the coming up of the sons of Israel from the land of Egypt.' . . . And all the sons of Israel came out, and the congregation was convened like one man, even from Dan and unto Beer-sheba, and the land of the Gilead, unto Jehovah at the Mizpah. And the prominent men of the whole people, all the tribes of Israel, took their places in" — that is, constituted themselves into — "the convention of the people of God. . . . And the sons of Israel said: 'How did this evil come to be?' And the Levite man answered," &c. Jud. xix. 29, 30, xx. 1, 2, 3. The same attribution of sovereignty to Israel continues to appear as the narrative proceeds. See for example, xx. 6, 10, 11, 12, xxi. 1, 8, 10.

² To this same mode of speaking belong the mention of Judah and Israel during this period, which has sometimes been mistaken for an anachronism. A careful examination will show that none of these instances is an allusion to the state of things which existed after the disruption under Jeroboam. Whenever Judah is mentioned in these earlier writings as distinct from Israel, the distinction is differ-

Now it is evident that, to the administration of David, after he became king over all Israel, it was important thus to insist upon the right of Judah to be first, and yet so to affirm it as to avoid offence to the other tribes, and secure their enthusiastic support. It was equally important to assert the unity of all Israel, and to stimulate national feeling. If these writings were produced at that date, they are accounted for by the circumstances of the times. Is there any other so good account of them?

Again these narratives take some pains to define, courteously, the relative position of the non-Israelite peoples. We learn from Jud. ii. 3, that the promise for the extermination of the Canaanites was formally withdrawn; from 1 Sam. vii. 14, that, in Samuel's time, peace was made with the Amorite; and from Jud. i. 28, 30, 33, 35, that the policy of extermination was changed for one which accepted the old inhabitants of the land as tributaries.¹ In several passages in

ent from that which prevailed in the later times. Sometimes, the tribal interests are mentioned, as differing from the national. Such an instance, after the anointing of David, is that in 1 Sam. xviii. 16, where it is said: "Now all Israel and Judah were loving David." It was a matter of course that David should be a favorite with the men of his own tribe. The author here asserts that he was a favorite with the whole nation, as well as with his own section of it, with all Israel as well as with Judah. Sometimes the reference is to the short-lived double kingdom, in the days of Ish-bosheth. But oftenest, the purpose is that already mentioned, namely, to assert the primacy of the tribe of Judah, and therefore, the especial claims of the Judaite royal family of David.

¹ "And I said: 'I will not break my covenant with you forever; while ye, for your part, shall not make covenant with the inhabitants of this land, ye shall break in pieces their altars.' And ye have not hearkened to my voice—how have ye done this? And (now) I also have said: 'I will not expel them from before you, and they shall be to you for (thorns in your) sides,'" &c. Jud. ii. 1-3.

"And there was peace between Israel and the Amorite. And Samuel judged Israel all the days of his life." 1 Sam. vii. 14, 15.

"When Israel was strong, he put the Canaanite to tribute-service, and did not utterly take possession of him."

"Zebulon did not take possession of the inhabitants of Kitron and the inhabitants of Nahalol, and the Canaanite dwelt in the midst of him, and they became for tribute-service."

"Naphtali did not take possession of the inhabitants of Beth-shemesh and the inhabitants of Beth-anath, and dwelt in the midst of the Canaanite, the inhabitants of the land; the inhabitants of Beth-shemesh and Beth-anath coming to be to them for tribute-service."

"And the Amorite persisted in dwelling in Mount Heres, in Ajalon and in Shaalbim, and the hand of the house of Joseph was heavy, and they became for tribute-service." Jud. i. 28, 30, 33, 35.

2 Samuel, 1 Kings, and 2 Chronicles, we learn that the policy adopted by David, and carried out by Solomon, was to treat the Canaanites as tributaries, from whom personal service was due.¹ A special word, **נִסְכָּם**, is used to describe this tribute-service. The same treatment of the Canaanites is described, using the same word, in Josh. xvi. 10, xvii. 13, and in the four places in the first chapter of Judges. The word is but little used, except in these passages. Perhaps the two verses in Joshua should be regarded as notes, mentioning the final outcome of the events there recorded, which outcome was some hundreds of years later than the events. In that case, all the accounts of tribute-service levied by Israel upon the Canaanites belong to the scheme of such service organized by David and Solomon. If, on the other hand, we regard the verses in Joshua as referring to the earlier times, then the verses in Judges must be regarded as citing the older instances partly for the purpose of showing that David's scheme was merely the carrying out, on a larger scale, of the ancient precedents. In either case, all these statements in regard to tribute-service, like the others we have been noticing, point to the time of the reign of David as affording the motives for the writing of this history.

The different subject peoples had already, before the close of David's reign, reached a condition in which they were likely to inquire why so wide a difference was made between them and the men of Israelite descent. They were themselves the subjects of David. The blood of the different races was already largely mixed. In the person of such men as Uriah the Hittite, they had their representatives in the army and in the court, rendering distinguished services to Israel's king. Their women were among the royal wives, and their blood ran in the veins of the princes of the royal house. Why, then, should they not be treated as on an equality with other

¹ "And Adoram was over the tribute-service," 2 Sam. xx. 24. This was in David's time. The details of this service, from the beginning of Solomon's reign to the years next succeeding his death, are given with some fulness in 1 Kings iv. 6, v. 13, 14 (27, 28), ix. 15, 21, xii. 18, 2 Chron. x. 18 and viii. 8. The last of these passages conveniently summarizes the whole, as follows: "All the remaining people of the Hittite and the Amorite and the Perizzite and the Hivvite and the Jebusite, who were not of Israel; of their sons who remained after them in the land, whom the sons of Israel did not make an end of, them Solomon subjected to tribute-service, unto this day." By the phrase "unto this day" is here meant, not to the time of the writing of the book of the Chronicles, but that of the document here copied into the Chronicles, which document is also in the parallel passage in Kings.

subjects? Why should they be subjected to especial tribute-service, and denied an equal opportunity for entering official positions? The Preface to the book of Judges answers all such questionings as these, by reminding the Canaanite peoples, at least, that, according to the ancient traditional relations between them and Israel, their present condition was one of favor to them and not of hardship, it being the alternative of the policy of extermination which had formerly prevailed. Since human nature is human nature, the later years of King David must often have witnessed the repeating of these questions and of this answer.

And since human nature is human nature, there were, doubtless, in those days, Israelites who protested, in the name of Israelitish orthodoxy, against the policy adopted by the government. They held the true doctrine to be that Canaanite people ought to be exterminated, instead of being employed, in bond-service, to build the house of the Lord. They must have been fearfully scandalized when they found it to be possible that a Canaanite half-breed might even be in charge of the most important departments of the work.¹ They had reason to be scandalized at certain results which followed when Hittite generals, having handsome wives, resided in Jerusalem, in the vicinity of the king's palace. As David's throne was largely dependent on the good will of his people, it must have been necessary to defend the public policy of the king in these matters, even if his private conduct was indefensible. If the making of such a defense was one of the purposes for which the books of Judges, Ruth, and Samuel were written, they accomplished the purpose. The royal descendant of Ruth and of Tamar was himself a standing proof of the fact that mixed blood might be genuinely Israelite, and consistent with the spirit, at least, of the law. The Preface to the book of Judges shows that the withdrawal of the promise of extermination, and inferentially, therefore, of the warrant for it, was not a thing of David's time, but something which occurred early in the period of the Judges. The same Preface either deals with technicalities confined to the reigns of David and Solomon, or else shows that David's policy of substituting tribute-service for extermination was not an innovation, but simply the reviving, under its ancient name, of a

¹ "And the king Solomon sent and took Hiram from Tyre. He was the son of a widow woman of the tribe of Naphtali, his father being a Tyrian man, an artificer in brass; and he was filled with the wisdom and with the understanding and with the knowledge for doing all work in brass. And he came unto the king Solomon, and did all his work," 1 Kings vii. 13, 14.

policy which had been adopted before the records contained in the book of Joshua were written. And as to the policy of permanent peace with the Amorite, involving as it did, the ultimate absorption of all the residents of Canaanitish blood into Israel, David did not originate that, but found it in existence, handed down from the times of Samuel, before Saul became king, 1 Sam. vii. 14.

All these considerations meet, as occasioning the production of these writings, provided the writings were produced while David was king over all Israel, after he had subjugated many of the neighboring peoples. At that time, it was important to define the status of the Canaanites who remained, and to do this in a conciliatory way. It was important to revive, both among them and among the other subjugated populations, any traditions of amity, like those recorded in the book of Ruth, which the past could furnish. Here again, we have evidence as to the date and purpose of these writings, and it agrees with the items previously cited.

To the same effect is the pains taken to account for certain circumstances mentioned in the times of David. For the heroic conduct of the men of Jabesh Gilead, in caring for the body of Saul, 1 Sam. xxxi. 11-13, we need no other reason than their gratitude for the deliverance which Saul had accomplished for them, 1 Sam. xi. ; and their sending to him for help is sufficiently accounted for by the fact that he had just been made king. But by referring to Jud. xxi. 12, we find that there were reasons of affinity between Jabesh Gilead and the tribe of Benjamin, which lay back of these other reasons, and played their part in bringing these others into existence. Or, as another instance, Caleb and the Kenites were somewhat prominent among the southern clans with which David was familiar in his wanderings, 1 Sam. xxv. 3, xxx. 14, xxvii. 10, xxx. 29, and xv. 6. The first chapter of Judges takes considerable pains to account for the presence of these peoples in the localities where David found them, though it does this, to some extent, at the cost of repeating matters written also in the book of Joshua. See verses 12-15 and 16.

Indeed, it is probable, in these cases as in the case of the tribute-service, that these repetitions from the history now found in Joshua are intended and significant. In David's time, the sons of Caleb were largely a shepherd people. Nabal the Carmelite was one of them. The Calebites and the Kenites appear to have been David's fast friends. David married Nabal's widow. He began his reign, as king of Judah, in the Calebite city of Hebron, reigning there seven and a half years, while the contest was being decided between him

and the house of Saul, 1 Sam. xxx. 31, 2 Sam. ii. 1, 2, 11, &c., 1 Kings ii. 11, 1 Chron. iii. 4, and context, xxix. 27, &c. In these circumstances, it is incredible but that the opponents of David were in the habit of speaking contemptuously of this Calebite king, perhaps taunting the Calebites with their relations to the Kenites, who were not at all of Israel. Indeed, when we remember that Caleb signifies *dog*, we may quite plausibly claim that we have on record at least one instance of this kind. In 2 Sam. iii. 8, Abner says to Ish-bosheth: "Am I a Caleb's head belonging to Judah? To-day I do a kindness to the house of Saul, . . . that I do not hand thee over into the hand of David," &c. When such taunts in respect to the Calebites were liable to be repeated, there was a reason for calling attention to the account of the location of Caleb, as given in the ancient received history of the nation, adding to it certain particulars, thus showing at once that the Calebites were of the best blue blood of Israel, and that their relations with the Kenites were strictly honorable to both. The account given in the first chapter of Judges accomplishes all this, as well as explains the existence of both a northern and a southern branch of the Kenite family, comp. Jud. iv. 11.

Again, as the story of Saul's search for the asses is not, on the whole, very flattering to that monarch, we may, perhaps, conclude that it was not published in Israel earlier than the time when the breach between him and David had become hopelessly permanent, and, therefore, not earlier than the later years of Samuel the prophet. If circulated in the days of the conflict between the house of David and that of Saul, it had the effect of showing, among other things, that if David was anointed some time before his being accepted as king, so also was Saul; that if David's anointing was private, so was Saul's; that if David's previous occupation was with sheep, Saul's was with asses; that if David's circumstances were narrow, Saul's were more so, and the like. In fine, while it is a story entirely respectful to Saul and his house, its effect is not at all to exalt the antecedents of the line of Saul above those of the line of David. It is just such a story as we might expect to find put into circulation in the interests of the throne of David, not very late in his reign.

All these considerations favor the opinion that our present Biblical history of the times of the Judges was both written and edited in the days of Samuel, David, Gad, and Nathan. It is not claimed that they prove this opinion, but only that they favor it. To make the proof complete, or to overthrow it, we should need to examine a large body of additional evidence, of various kinds, bearing upon the question.

The Righteousness which is of Faith.¹*Romans x. 4-11.*

BY PROF. J. F. GENUNG, PH.D.

THE confessed difficulty of this passage is not grammatical nor lexical ; nor does it lie in the use that St. Paul here makes of the words of Moses. So far as regards its external features the passage is simple enough. As little is the difficulty due to the mere intricacy of the thought. Let once the clue be secured and faithfully held, and the thought is not lacking in clearness. But it is a thought at once high and deep, and wellnigh immeasurable both ways. Besides, —and herein lies the real difficulty, — the passage is, perhaps preëminently in the whole New Testament, the meeting-ground of the great foundation-ideas of Christianity. As Richard Wagner in his musical dramas blends together widely varying *motives* — melodic, rhythmic, harmonic — to bring out by their union some master idea or situation ; so here are interwoven the great Christian and Jewish *motives*, — righteousness, faith, law, Christ, — each preserving its individuality, yet each contributing to the expression of the others, and all uniting to form a new concept, the righteousness which is of faith.

There is indeed a real problem here ; one which no doubt occurs to every Christian thinker, and which, so far as I am aware, is not distinctly answered elsewhere in the New Testament. Faith in Christ is counted to the believer for righteousness ; this, however, not because it is in any sense a substitute for righteousness. There can be no such substitute ; righteousness is an eternal demand, to Christian as to Jew ; and such righteousness is fundamentally conformity to a law. Faith then is counted for righteousness because it is a power to produce righteousness. But when now we are bidden to have faith in Christ and leave the old dead law, and when we are assured that all this provision is made “that the righteousness *of the law* might be fulfilled in us,” it is not at once obvious how committal to a personal Lord, and that too with apparent slighting of the law, is nevertheless to work conformity to the law. There is a letting go of the old, but there is not apparent such a grasp of the new as to work

¹ Read in June, 1884.

the assured result. This then is the problem: how does faith produce righteousness?

To solve this problem these four ideas, righteousness, faith, law, Christ, two Jewish and two Christian, are here interwoven. But while all the ideas retain their distinctive individuality, each takes a coloring from the others, is expressed, as far as may be, in terms of the others. Christ is the end of the law for righteousness. Righteousness is described in terms of faith. Faith is represented as laying plans for work, for the achievement which is righteousness; and yet faith's achievement is expressed not in terms of law, but of Christ. All this produces the remarkable mingling of dialects which chiefly makes the passage difficult. In the interpretation, therefore, we need first, to consider each constituent idea, in the particular aspect which its present relation gives it; and then we shall be prepared to trace the greater concept as a whole.

I.

In the first place, then, what office does each of these ideas fulfil in the whole definition, and how is its aspect modified by the influence of the others?

1. Righteousness. What we need to bear in mind regarding this word is, that it is a constant term. It does not mean one thing in the Old Testament and another in the New. Righteousness — rightness — is nothing less than conformity to the law of holiest manhood, which is the law of God; and hence, whenever and wherever achieved, it is one righteousness, just as God is one and manhood one. Its requirements are as great for Christian as for Jew, nay, greater, because its standard is more completely and searchingly defined. Among the earliest declarations of Christ's ministry was the solemn word, "Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." Then He took up the old legislation point by point, and showed how much more inward and genuine obedience must thenceforth be than ever before.

If then righteousness is eternally one, Moses' definition of it remains as true as it ever was. "The man that *doeth* the righteousness which is of the law shall live thereby." Though produced by faith, it remains essentially a doing, a work, an achievement; and though the law is not of faith (Gal. iii. 12), yet the provision of faith in Christ and of walking in the Spirit is made "that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us" (Rom. viii. 4).

The two contrasts used in our passage and its context in the definition of righteousness need a word of discrimination.

a. The two terms here contrasted, the righteousness which is of the law, and the righteousness which is of faith, designate not two different righteousnesses, but two different means of attaining the same righteousness. The contrast, indicated by the preposition of origin ἐκ, is simply between the ἐκ νόμου and the ἐκ πίστεως; and the whole passage is Paul's masterly way of showing how faith accomplishes "what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh."

b. The other contrast, drawn in the 3d verse of this chapter, illustrates the mingling of dialects of which I have spoken. "For [the Jews], being ignorant of God's righteousness, and seeking to establish their own, did not subject themselves to the righteousness of God." So far as it is the result of a man's personal effort, righteousness must be counted his own; it is something worked for and achieved. But if it appears in a divine Standard, to be attained by divine help, it is the righteousness of God; and then it may be described in terms of faith, as something to be "submitted to." It is the same righteousness from different points of view.

2. Faith. To make clear its harmony with the other *motives* in the great symphony, this element must be viewed as an active, energizing principle, not as mere passive receptiveness. Faith is to achieve what work has always tried to achieve; and therefore, while it remains just as truly trust in a transcendent source of help, it must yet have an initiative in itself, plan for attaining and against recreancy. This active nature of faith is very suggestively recognized here in the form of the expression. While the ἐκ νόμου righteousness is treated as a dead concept, to be discussed and defined, the ἐκ πίστεως righteousness is represented as speaking, warning, instinct with life. "The righteousness which is of faith *speaketh* on this wise." This fact indeed is no mere figure of speech or alternative expression, but contains the root of the whole contrast. Under the law, "the man which doeth . . . shall live." Life is here the goal, not the starting-point: it is set before the doer as something to be worked *toward*, but not yet achieved. Under faith we may reverse the proposition, and say, The man which liveth shall do, or rather *will* do, for the doing is chosen and loved. Faith, which in its deepest is communion of divine life, has first of all imparted life to the believer: this life therefore is the starting-point, to be worked *from*, and its goal is Christ's risen glory. This new righteousness then has a voice, a character, for itself; it is just the result that comes when a divinely given life works out spontaneously the law of its being. It is faith in action.

3. Christ and the Law. Concerning these two elements we need

here to recognize the fact that they are absolutely identified with each other. "Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth." What therefore was once expressed as conformity to law becomes in the new dialect conformity to Christ, because in His life

"the law appears
Drawn out in living characters."

For the believer Christ and law are convertible terms ; and to achieve righteousness is simply to achieve the life of Christ.

With this identification of terms in view, we need now to return a moment and make a closer discrimination in our definition of faith. Inasmuch as Christ is our Redeemer, offering us salvation, our faith is a trust in His promise and acceptance of His terms. "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." This aspect of faith, however, is not the one to be emphasized here. Here faith is turned toward achieving ; it must be expressed, as far as may be, in terms of action, because out of it comes righteousness. It views Christ therefore as personal Lord and Pattern, to whom allegiance and conformity are due ; and thus its attitude may perhaps best be expressed by the word loyalty. It is the active principle of trust, centered in a person, and looking toward achievement.

II.

Having thus sought, as the foundation of our treatment, a careful discrimination of terms, let us now trace step by step the apostle's solution of the problem how faith produces righteousness.

1. Faith in its present attitude, as we have noticed, takes the form of loyalty. In curious accordance with this idea, the righteousness which is of faith is represented at the outset as uttering a monition against disloyalty, or recreancy. "The righteousness which is of faith speaketh thus, 'Say not in thy heart, Who shall ascend into heaven? (that is, to bring Christ down;) or, who shall descend into the abyss?' (that is, to bring Christ up from the dead). But what saith it? 'The word is nigh thee, in thy mouth and in thy heart': that is, the word of faith, which we preach." This last sentence makes it evident what is the temper of mind here contemplated and warned against. Tholuck, and after him Alford, have raised the inquiry whether these questions, Who shall ascend? who shall descend? betoken unbelief, or embarrassment, or anxiety. They betoken none of the three. They are simply the questionings of a disloyal heart,

seeking in some way to evade its ideal. Such questionings, such disloyalty, the righteousness which is of faith forestalls and checks. It says in effect: "Cherish no querulous evasions. Seek not to cheapen the terms of your righteousness. The way is plain and straight before you. Christ is your ideal, just as He is preached; Christ the glorified, Christ the crucified and risen. Take Him as He is, the embodiment of your righteousness; be loyal to Him, whatever the heights or depths to which He leads you; and seek not to make Him other."

2. Let us consider a moment what loyalty would require, and what disloyalty would seek to evade, in the double light of the terms law and Christ.

The law holds before men an ideal to be attained, and perfect righteousness is the complete attainment of the ideal. Now in the endeavor to achieve what the law demands, two conceivable temptations may arise: the temptation to lower the ideal, or the temptation in seeking it to choose a less strenuous way than the law dictates. That is, the unfaithful worker may desire, in order to make his work easier, to debase either the end to be reached or the means of reaching it.

Transfer now this fundamental idea to the new standard of righteousness. Christ, as the end, the complete embodiment of the law, is the loyal soul's ideal; and the righteousness which is of faith is the achievement of Christ-likeness. Now the law embodied in a person, as in a statute, has, if we may so say, its heights and its depths; there is a supreme goal of attainment, and a strenuous road thereto, neither of which the truly loyal soul will think of evading. The supreme height of Christ is measured by the glory on which He entered when His course was done, "the name which is above every name" given to Him as the reward of His faithfulness (Phil. ii. 9). Nothing short of this can measure the requirements of ideal righteousness, in terms of Christ. The lowliest depth of Christ, the most searching and strenuous humiliation, is measured by His obedience to the death of the cross (Phil. ii. 7, 8). That this freely chosen death was in the way of righteousness is evinced by the fact that it issued in resurrection. Christ's glory was the sequence not of a mere ascension, through various grades of dignity, but of resurrection, which was preceded by death and humiliation. If then the believer's righteousness takes its ideal from Christ, it seeks its glory through resurrection; that is, it submits to the same obedience unto death, in the faith that there will surely be a rising again. Nothing less strenuous than this can measure, in terms of Christ, the involvements of ideal righteousness.

3. Now the righteousness which is of faith is here represented as warning the believer against questioning with regard to these very things, the height and the depth of Christ, who is his chosen ideal of life. Let us examine the monition it gives.

a. "Say not in thy heart, 'Who shall ascend into heaven?' (that is, to bring Christ down)." Here, and in the next three verses, Paul adopts a passage from Deut. xxx. 11-14, and uses it, much as we might run our thoughts into a line of Hamlet or Macbeth. He takes it as affording spontaneously a mould for his idea, yet makes it thoroughly his own by changing it freely to suit his purpose, and by adding running comments interpreting it for the case in hand. We are not to view this then as Paul's exegesis of an Old Testament passage; nor are we bound to suppose that his present application of it must necessarily be involved in the original. As a matter of fact he changes the application essentially; but this because he takes the thought as his own, no longer as the former writer's. The expression here, however, has to some degree the disadvantage of every quoted passage; we feel that it was not moulded originally for this present thought; and while we recognize its pertinence, yet we must rely more on the interpretation than on the quotation. There must be much weight therefore in the comment, "That is, to bring Christ down." And from our foregoing discussion we are prepared to see clearly what this whole passage means. It is the natural questioning of a soul tempted to disloyalty, as it stands half discouraged before its high and seemingly unattainable ideal. It is as if the believer should say: "Who shall bring Christ's glory (my ideal of righteousness) lower, ever so little lower, give me less to do, set my aspiration toward a height not so obviously unattainable, that I may have more reasonable hope of achieving." Against such a recreant spirit faith takes its stand, holds the heart true to its ideal, checks the doubt before it rises, and thus works to produce righteousness. Such a true spirit of allegiance cannot bear to make its standard lower, but will seek to rise where Christ has risen.

b. "Say not in thy heart, 'Who shall descend into the abyss?' (that is, to bring Christ up from the dead)." Here, in quoting from Deuteronomy, Paul substitutes for "beyond the sea," the words *εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον*, "into the abyss," and with obvious reason: having thought of the heights of Christ and Christ-likeness, he now turns naturally to the corresponding depths. The intent of asking such a question, he says, is "to bring Christ up from the dead." With our foregoing discussion in mind, few if any words are now needed to

make this thought clear. We have here the natural questioning of a disloyal soul, seeking to make the means of attaining righteousness less strenuous. Christ's way to His glory was the way of death and resurrection. It involved a *κένωσις*, an utter self-abnegation and obedience, which to a soul not fully in earnest might well seem appalling. Now in our aspiration after Christ-likeness we may well be tempted to ask: "Is there no easier way to the goal? Must it lie through the grave, through death to self and sin, through uttermost submission, before it can issue in resurrection and glory? Who will descend into the abyss and bring Christ up, make His glory a glory without previous humiliation, restore Him from the grave and make His death as if it had never been?" Such questions as these are very near and very practical; because they have to do with the exactions of our own righteousness, which is measured by Christ. But the righteousness which is of faith checks and forestalls any such complaint; it will not consent to a way less genuine, less strenuous, less deeply involving, than that which its great Pattern has taken. Witness how heartily Paul himself chose this way, when in his letter to the Philippians he gave utterance to his supreme desire: "that I may win Christ and be found in Him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith; that I may know Him, and the power of His resurrection, and the fellowship of His sufferings, being made conformable unto His death; if by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead."

4. The remainder of our passage follows out with wonderful consistency the idea we have traced. "But what saith it? The word is nigh thee, in thy mouth and in thy heart." In the use of this quotation we need to eliminate any idea of place, as if righteousness were something to *go and get*: it is simply Paul's employment of Moses' words to express the idea that the way of righteousness is plain and obvious, not to be mistaken, not to be evaded. The word is just "the word of faith, which we preach"; it needs no further definition; it is simply that everywhere familiar apostolic teaching, setting forth Christ and the Christ-ideal. No curious search, no ingenious interpretation is needed, to determine our standard: "the wayfaring men, though fools, shall not err therein."

The words "in thy mouth and in thy heart" furnish a suggestion which Paul turns with wonderful skill to his present thought. "The mouth" and "the heart" suggest the outside and the inside of Christian righteousness. The one is just as genuine, just as indispensable,

as the other. "With the mouth confession is made unto salvation." Confession is the believer's self-exaction of righteousness. If before the world he acknowledges Christ as Lord, he avowedly takes upon himself, for men to see and judge, the life of Christ, with its heights and depths, with its humiliation and glory, as a practical standard of conduct. "If thou wilt confess with thy mouth Jesus as Lord." After the foregoing definition, can we call this a light thing? Is it a mere formality?

"With the heart man believeth unto righteousness;" and the vital point, chosen of all others, wherein loyalty is tested is, the resurrection of Christ. "If thou wilt believe in thy heart that God raised Him from the dead." This is no arbitrary doctrine, chosen out of many as a test creed; it represents simply the fulness of practical trust in the Christ-life we have chosen. For when we accept as a standard of conduct the obedience unto death which our Lord exemplified, we cannot see the end; it must be done in faith that such death, though it seem to close every hope, will not fail to issue in resurrection. So this historic belief, that God raised Christ from the dead, is vitally connected with ourselves; it involves the belief that we, who are planted in the likeness of the same death, shall be raised together with Him. This central belief in the heart, therefore, is the most searching and yet the most natural test of the righteousness which is of faith, because it indicates how faith exerts its uttermost.

"For the Scripture saith, 'Whosoever believeth on Him shall not be ashamed.'" In the light of the foregoing this would seem to mean, not "shall not be put to shame," as by some supposable disaster, but, shall not cherish shame, or be confounded, because of what he has taken upon himself. Whosoever believeth on Christ shall take the plain word of faith, wonderful and deep-searching as it is, and without stumbling at it or seeking to evade, without being dismayed by end or means, or letting any spirit of disloyalty arise, go on buoyantly and confidently, until the same deep valley is passed and the same heights won, that are revealed in the life and death of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Perhaps now the best way to leave this subject will be to recapitulate the foregoing thought by reducing it to propositions.

1. Faith does not seek life through righteousness, but achieves righteousness through committal to Christ's perfect life.
 2. Faith will not debase the Christlike ideal, however high its aim, but confesses it before the world as a practical standard of life.
 3. Faith will not evade the Christlike way to the ideal, however deep its involvements, but cherishes the spirit of it as an inner trust.
- And so, faith produces righteousness.

A Syriac Manuscript with the Antilegomena Epistles.¹

BY PROF. I. H. HALL, PH.D.

IN September last (1884) I announced in *THE INDEPENDENT* the discovery of a manuscript of the Acts and Epistles, among which occur also the Epistles that were *antilegomena* among the Syrians; namely the Second Epistle of Peter, the Second and Third Epistles of John, and the Epistle of Jude, in the version usually printed with our Peshitto New Testaments. It is well known that the printed copies of these Epistles in that version all rest upon one manuscript only, in the Bodleian Library at Oxford, England, from which they were first published by Edward Pococke (Leyden, Elzevirs) in 1630. That edition, with various editorial conjectures, is the parent of all the printed texts. In a former article in the *Journal of the Society of Biblical Exegesis and Literature* I have already expressed my opinion that they actually belong to the Philoxenian version.

By hunting over the catalogues of manuscripts in the European libraries, I found that the Pococke Ms., though the only one practically known to the critics, is not absolutely the only other known Ms. copy containing that version of these epistles. All that are known at present are about six or seven in number, and are of values greatly varying; some being copies of others, and one being nothing more than a copy of the printed text of the Paris Polyglott. But this one found by me is the second one likely to be available to the critics.

The manuscript was obtained some fifteen years ago by the late Rev. William Frederic Williams, then missionary to Mardin, by whom it was sent to his brother, Robert S. Williams, Esq., of Utica, New York, who is its present owner. Mr. Williams kindly placed the Ms. at my service for examination and study; when I discovered the nature of its contents. Just where the Ms. was obtained it is now impossible to say, as Mr. Williams' missionary work kept him on continual journeys. It was obtained from an aged priest, who probably parted with it only because he was unable to read it.

¹ Read in December, 1884.

The Ms. is written on cotton paper, *charta damascena*, in a rather western Syrian hand, in two columns to the page, and regularly twenty-five lines to the column. One leaf, the first, is now gone; but it originally contained 150 leaves (of its proper matter), and two leaves more for a poem at the end. The size of the leaf is $10\frac{1}{2}$ by $7\frac{1}{2}$ inches; of the columns, $8\frac{1}{2}$ by 5 inches. The quires are *quiniones* in the first part of the book, but in the latter part they are *quaterniones*, except the last, which is a *ternio*. While most of the manuscript is written on paper of double thickness, some portions are written on paper of single thickness, which, probably from the glazing, has a darker color than the rest, and allows the ink to show through. But all is of the same age, as appears by many proofs. A later hand has numbered the folios, in Syriac numerals. The Ms. appears to be in its original binding (except a new back), leather, with a flap; the board within the leather being composed of older Syriac Mss.

The contents of the Ms. are as follows: Tables to find the movable feasts, and also of the church-lessons from the Acts and Epistles; then the Acts and Catholic Epistles, and the Pauline Epistles, in the usual order, ending with Hebrews. At the end of the Epistles is a colophon which says that it was finished at noon on Thursday, the fourth of the sultry month Tammuz, in the year of the Greeks 1782; which answers to our July 4th, 1471; which day indeed fell on a Thursday. After the colophon follows a poem of 128 lines, all ending with the same syllable (but hardly rhyming according to our ideas), consisting of a hymn to the Trinity, and a narrative of the construction of the manuscript. The scribe conceals his own name, but shows himself to be a stranger in the land where it was written. The poem is worth quoting at length for its matter, though it is not necessary here, except the following extracts:

"This book, in which are the Acts of the Apostles,
 And their Catholic Epistles that are seven,
 And the seven and seven of him that was architect of the faith —
 Fourteen Epistles of Paul [who was] filled with wisdom —
 Was written for my dear brother in love,
 Young Selimûn, who loves the wisdom from the son of David,
 Who endured much weariness with me, and showed me much kindness,
 And in all my straitness shared with me in prudence.
 A wretch wrote it, who is full of faults and all things hateful —
 A stranger, yea, a sojourner in the region —
 And things not worthy that I should sign plainly in my book
 The name of my poverty, with a hand full of faults and follies.

Behold, my head bowed, and with urgings and sighs,
 I beseech the brethren, whom time in its length shall bring,
 That they will pray for me with a kind heart and with diligence,
 And that they will say to the Lord, with their remembrances and prayers :
 Good Lord, abundant in love and full of goodness,
 Pardon thy servant, who wrote this book in love;
 Forgive his defects, also his folly, and all faults
 That were committed by him in this world full of trouble;
 Forgive his fathers who erred in their opinion of the faith,
 And make their souls to dwell with thee in the kingdom."

From various internal reasons I have been inclined to suppose that the scribe was one of the St. Thomas, or Malabar Syriac Christians, on a visit to his western brethren ; one of a set like those later comers, who wrote the Leyden Apocalypse and a few other Mss. extant in Europe. The poem at the end calls the writer a layman, and uses the far-eastern term "*Sahib*" to characterize one of his friends. Besides what appears above, the poem tells who furnished the paper, and who paid for the writing. The prayer, of which only a part is given above, includes other benefactors ; among them his two grandmothers and his mother, who brought him up and paid the expenses of his education ; besides a number of others whom he specifies by name as having helped him in his place of exile, and been "diligent to establish his living without impediment." Another part of the poem, unfortunately mutilated in a very interesting spot, speaks of the compilation of the matter of the book, and may be allowed to tell its own story :

"I have been diligent with this book [in my place of exile?]
 Vowel-signs and vowel-points . . .
 Abominable to the Lord is . . .
 And what also is that which is written according to strength?
 Let no man say that this . . .
 Or that in my good knowledge or strength . . .
 Far be it ; this shall not be to the man . . .
 Since I am vile, of the children of the grave,
 But I brought forward my writing to this worthy diligence,
 Just as a witness who in weakness beholds the letters.
 But it came to this polish for two reasons:
 First, from love to him who purchased the book and its polish ;
 And second, because I had learned accuracy
 In respect to all the points and vowels of the words and syllables.
 I gathered books, so that what I knew not might be investigated ;
 And I proved them in the strength of God who giveth wisdom ;
 And in this book and that book, with fixed attention,
 I kept closely scrutinizing, bringing it forth word by word.

And this also is a thing that shows a work of prosperity,
That no man has minished aught from it of the sweet strength of sweet-
ness (or, correctness)."

(In the last line the word for "sweetness" contains a play that cannot be rendered: it means "correctness" as well.)

However, an Arabic note at the end of the tables at the beginning of the Mss. forces us to modify the conclusion naturally drawn from this poem, and to consider the present manuscript not the original work therein referred to, but a *contemporaneous copy* thereof, and not unlikely by the same scribe. The Arabic note states that one Daûd esh-Shâmi il-Homsi (David the Syrian of Homs, or Hamath) had found this excellent work, owned by Suleimân (the name spelled Selimûn in the Syriac poem), at the fortress of Husn Kifa; and finding it so much better than any Ms. of the Acts and Catholic Epistles he ever saw (and he had seen many), and divided into its chapters and sections, provided with lessons, notes, etc., and its most accurately supplied vowels and points, had obtained a copy for his own use. Husn Kifa, as the Arabic geographers give it, was a fortress overlooking the Tigris, either quite up in Armenia, or on the borders of Armenia and Mesopotamia (the doubt is not as to the site, but within which country that site was included). Husn Kifa is doubtless, therefore, the home both of that original which was compiled and written by the unknown scribe, and of this its copy, which was made, as appears above, during the life-time of Selimûn, with proper care and under good auspices. Daûd il-Homsi would not be called "il-Homsi" at home, in Homs; and that fact goes against the supposition of the Ms. having been brought westward by him. But where Mr. Williams found the Ms. is no nearer discovery than before. The fly-leaves of the Ms. contain numerous scrawls in Syriac, Carshun, and Arabic, which give a few owners' names; but I have not yet made out any complete history of its possessors. A few of the scrawls are in Nestorian script.

Besides the scribe's general introduction and colophon, there is a preface to the Acts, to the Catholic Epistles as a whole, and to each of the Pauline Epistles. The preface to the Acts is avowedly (and the others are actually) taken from the "Treasure of Mysteries of Mafrianus," i.e. of Gregory Bar Hebræus. The Syrian chapters (ܡܬܬܐ) are marked in the text by the single or double diamond of dots (except when they coincide with a church-lesson), and are numbered in the margin. The church-lesson notes are written in red in

the body of the text, and also numbered in the margin. In both these series of numberings the Acts and Catholic Epistles are treated as one book, and the Pauline Epistles as another. The Syrian chapters are the same as the very ancient ones, with one remarkable exception, caused by the introduction of the four *antilegomena*. In the ancient and ordinary division the Acts and Catholic Epistles have 32 sections or chapters; section 31 beginning at 1 John, ii. 7; and section 32 at iii. 21. But in this Ms. section 31 begins at 2 Peter i. 13; section 32 at 2 Peter iii. 8; section 33 at 1 John ii. 21; section 34 at 1 John iv. 2; and section 35 (the last) at 3 John 1. The *antilegomena* thus add three sections. The church-lesson titles and numbers within these books show also that the *antilegomena* were read in church, by those who used the system here given. It may be added for the sake of those who wish to know the space occupied by these Epistles in the Ms., that 2 Peter begins on fol. 57, *b*, col. 2, at the middle, and ends at fol. 60, *b*, col. 2, near the top; 2 John begins at fol. 64, *b*, col. 1, one-third of the way down; 3 John begins at fol. 65, *a*, col. 1, one-fourth of the way down; Jude at fol. 65, *b*, one-third of the way down; and ends at fol. 66, *b*, one-third of the way down the page, its writing on this last page not running in columns, but carrying the lines across the page.

The titles and subscriptions to these Epistles are generally quite simple; that of 2 John being merely: "End. Verses forty." The title and preface to the Catholic Epistles as a whole, however, is worth giving in full; as is also the subscription:

Title: "Again in the strength of the Trinity we write the Catholic Epistles.

Preface: Three Catholic, that is, General, Epistles were translated into Syriac from the beginning; one of James, the brother of our Lord, who was bishop in Jerusalem, and wrote to the believing people that were scattered in every place of captivities and persecutions, and to them was directed this first epistle. And the second, of Peter; and the third, of John. But men have doubted about them, because they were not like the [proper] style of speech, and because they were not written to any one person or people. But Eusebius assures [us] that they are theirs. Afterwards there were translated the second epistle of Peter; and the second of John; and again the third of John, to Gaius, in which he accuses Diotrephes [spelled Diophterus] the chief of the church of not receiving strangers; and one of Jude the son of Joseph, in which are collected sayings that are instructive to good and bad, and those that teach us concerning lusts of the flesh."

Subscription: "End the Seven Catholic Epistles; one of James, and two of Peter, and three of John, and one of Jude the apostle. All of them, one with another, are divided into ten chapters, and contain collectively 1483 verses. God be merciful to every one who is a friend of this book."

With regard to the *text* of these epistles, it is far better than that of the Pococke Epistles, or of the (rather poor) manuscript which he used. Almost all the places where Pococke saw error and had to emend, or to suggest emendation, conjecturally, are right in this Ms. Sometimes, however, it agrees with the Bodleian Ms. against the editorial conjectures. The careless, but easily made error of "in the world" for "among the people," for instance, 2 Peter ii. 1, which ought never to have been suffered to get into the printed editions, but which is in all of them, is not in this Ms.

Throughout the Ms., however, the writing is voweled with great fullness and great care. The points *qushshoyo* and *ruchocho*, which show the hard or soft sounds of the *begadkepat* letters are supplied in red. And the text generally is excellent among Syriac texts. (Of course all but the *antilegomena* are of the Peshitto version.) The margins are abundantly supplied with linguistic and grammatical notes, written some in Syriac and some in Arabic. The ulterior source of these notes I have not yet ascertained; some of them are wholly from Gregory Bar Hebræus; some in part from him and in part not. These notes treat of a great variety of matters; generally of vowels and points, but sometimes of differences in pronunciation between the Eastern and Western Syrians; sometimes justifying the scribe's correction of a former matter, and so on. A note at Philipians i. 15, last word, justifies the adoption of the participle instead of the imperfect tense in accordance with antiquity and accuracy, though against most of our printed copies.

On the whole, this Ms. is very valuable for its texts and its notes; not only as a carefully edited copy of the ancient text, but as a linguistic and grammatical treatise. Its place is high among manuscripts, although the date of its writing is not so very remote. It is easy to see, from Pococke's edition, that this Ms. is every way superior to the Bodleian as a copy of the *antilegomena* epistles. But the special points of the sort can hardly be treated of till the collation of the Ms. is completed. A table of the church-lesson titles is here appended.

Acts and Catholic Epistles.

1. Of the Ascension of our Lord to heaven.	Acts i. 1-14.
2. Of the oblation of Thursday of Mysteries.	15-26.
3. Of the bowing the knees (adoration) of Pentecost.	ii. 1-21.
4. Of the dawn of Great Sunday of the Resurrection.	22-36.
5. Of the fifth Monday of the Fast, and for any day.	37-47.
6. Of Golden Friday.	iii. 1-10.

7. Of Monday <i>in albis</i> .	Acts iii. 11-26.
8. Of the fifth Tuesday of the Fast, and of Martyrs.	iv. 1-12.
9. Of the fifth Wednesday of the Fast.	13-22.
10. Of the fifth Thursday of the Fast.	23-31.
11. Of Tuesday <i>in albis</i> .	32-37.
12. Of the departed.	v. 1-11.
13. Of the Fathers and of the Apostles, and of the fifth Friday of the Fast.	12-21.
14. Of the fifth Saturday of the Fast.	21-28.
15. Of Wednesday <i>in albis</i> .	29-42.
16. Of martyrs and of saints generally, and of Friday of confessors.	vi. 1-7.
17. Of one person of the holy martyrs.	8-vii. 3.
18. Of the annunciation of Zacharias, and of Thursday <i>in albis</i> .	vii. 4-16.
19. Of the slaying of the children.	17-29.
20. Of matins of Sunday first of Hosannas.	30-36.
21. Of Saturday of Rest.	37-43.
22. Of the commemoration of the Mother of God, and of the going up, and of the dedication of a church.	44-53.
23. Of the commemoration of Stephen.	54-viii. 2.
24. Of the third Sunday after Resurrection.	viii. 3-13.
25. Of the fourth Sunday after Resurrection.	14-25.
26. Of the blessing of the waters, and of baptism.	26-40.
27. Of the Sunday of the coming in of the Fast.	ix. 1-9.
28. Of baptism.	10-21.
29. Of the third Sunday of the Fast.	22-35.
30. In commemoration of the departed.	36-43.
31. Of the first Monday of the Fast.	x. 1-8.
32. Of the Apostles.	9-24.
33. Of the first Tuesday of the Fast.	25-33.
34. Of the first Wednesday of the Fast, and of baptism.	34-xi. 1.
35. Of the first Thursday of the Fast.	xi. 2-18.
36. Of the first Friday of the Fast.	19-30.
37. Of the first Saturday of the Fast, and of the Apostle Peter.	xii. 1-11.
38. Of the second Sunday of the Fast.	12-24.
39. Of the fourth Sunday of the Fast.	25-xiii. 12.
40. Of the Passion Monday, and of John the Baptist.	xiii. 13-25.
41. Of the great Sunday of Resurrection.	26-43.
42. Of Passion Tuesday.	44-xiv. 7.
43. Of Wednesday of the earthquakes, and of the Apostle Paul.	xiv. 8-20.
44. Of the fourth Monday of the Fast, and of the consecration of a church.	20-xv. 3.
45. Of the matins of Thursday of Mysteries.	xv. 4-12.
46. Of the fourth Tuesday of the Fast.	13-22.
47. Of Wednesday the middle of the Fast.	23-34.
48. Of the fourth Thursday of the Fast.	35-xvi. 1.
49. Of the fourth Friday of the Fast, and of the Circumcision.	xvi. 1-7.
50. Of the fourth Saturday of the Fast.	8-15.

51. Of the fifth Sunday of the Fast, and of the forty martyrs.	Acts xvi. 16-34
52. Of the sixth Sunday of the Fast.	35-xvii. 4.
53. Of the night of Friday of the Crucifixion.	xvii. 5-12.
54. Of the fifth Sunday after Resurrection.	13-21.
55. Of the sixth Sunday after Resurrection.	22-34.
56. Of the third Sunday after Epiphany, and of commemoration of the saints.	xviii. 1-8.
57. Of the fourth Sunday after Epiphany.	9-17.
58. Of the fifth Sunday after Epiphany.	18-28.
59. Of matins of the Sunday of Pentecost.	xix. 1-12.
60. Of the first Sunday after Pentecost.	13-22.
61. Of the second Sunday after Pentecost.	23-29.
62. Of the third Sunday after Pentecost.	30-xx. 6.
63. Of the departed.	xx. 7-12.
64. Of Thursday after Ascension, and of the Saints and Fathers.	13-21.
65. Of the election (<i>χειροτονία</i>) of a bishop, and of the fourth Sunday after Pentecost.	22-38.
66. Of the Sunday after Pentecost.	xxi. 1-14.
67. Of the sixth Sunday after Pentecost.	15-26.
68. Of the seventh Sunday after Pentecost.	27-36.
69. Of the eighth Sunday after Pentecost.	37-xxii. 5.
70. Of the ninth Sunday after Pentecost.	xxii. 6-21.
71. Of the tenth Sunday after Pentecost.	22-29.
72. Of matins of Friday of the Crucifixion.	30-xxiii. 11.
73. Of the third hour of Friday of the Crucifixion.	xxiii. 12-21.
74. Of midday of the Friday.	22-35.
75. Of the ninth hour of Friday of the Crucifixion.	xxiv. 1-10.
76. Of Monday of Hosannas.	10-23.
77. Of Tuesday of Hosannas.	24-xxv. 5.
78. Of the sixth Wednesday of the Fast.	xxv. 6-12.
79. Of Thursday of Hosannas.	13-22.
80. Of Friday of the forty.	23-xxvi. 1.
81. Of the dawn of Saturday of the raising of Lazarus.	xxvi. 1-11.
82. Of matins of the raising of Lazarus.	12-23.
83. Of the eleventh Sunday after Pentecost.	24-xxvii. 8.
84. Of the twelfth Sunday after Pentecost.	xxvii. 8-17.
85. Of the thirteenth Sunday after Pentecost.	18-26.
86. Of the fourteenth Sunday after Pentecost.	27-38.
87. Of the fifteenth Sunday after Pentecost.	39-44.
88. Of the sixteenth Sunday after Pentecost.	xxviii. 1-10.
89. Of the seventeenth Sunday after Pentecost.	11-22.
90. Of the eighteenth Sunday after Pentecost.	23-31.
91. Of commemoration of the martyrs.	James i. 1-12.
92. Of the second Sunday after Epiphany.	13-27.
93. Of the second Monday of the Fast.	ii. 1-13.
94. Of the second Tuesday of the Fast.	14-26.

95. Of the second Wednesday of the Fast. James iii. 1-12.
 96. Of the second Thursday of the Fast. 13-iv. 6.
 97. Of the second Friday of the Fast. iv. 7-v. 6.
 98. Of the second Saturday of the Fast, and of priests and fathers, and of
 the prophetic night. v. 7-20.
 [99.] Of New Sunday, and of the third Monday of the Fast. 1 Peter i. 1-12.
 100. Of the tonsure of Monks, and of the third Tuesday of the Fast. 13-25.
 101. Of the going up of our Lord to the Temple, and of the third
 Wednesday of the Fast. ii. 1-10.
 102. Of John the Baptist, and of the third Thursday of the Fast, and
 adoration of the cross. 11-25.
 103. Of the customary blessing (*i.e.*, of bridegroom and bride). iii. 1-7.
 104. Of the sixth Sunday of Epiphany, and of the third Friday of the
 Fast. 7-17.
 105. Of matins of Saturday of the Annunciation. 18-iv. 6.
 106. Of the seventh Sunday after Epiphany, and of the third Saturday
 of the Fast, and of Supplications. iv. 7-19.
 107. Of the fourteenth Sunday after Pentecost, and of the election of
 bishops. v. 1-14.
 108. Of the commemoration of Peter chief of the apostles. 2 Peter i. 1-15.
 109. Of the Feast of Tabernacles. i. 16-ii. 8.
 110. Of Monday of Nineveh. ii. 9-19.
 111. Of Tuesday of Nineveh. ii. 19-iii. 7.
 112. Of the departed. iii. 8-18.
 113. Of the Sunday after the Nativity, and of dawn of the time of the
 Nativity, and of the Annunciation. 1 John i. 1-ii. 6.
 114. Of the oblation of Sunday, the first of Hosannas. ii. 7-17.
 115. Of the festival of the cross. 18-iii. 1.
 116. Of the Mother of God, and of the first Monday of the Fast, and
 of Supplications. iii. 2-24.
 117. Of the Nativity of our Lord that was in the flesh. iv. 1-10.
 118. Of the mysterious Saturday, and of the Sunday after Epiphany, and
 of the time of remission. 11-21.
 119. Of the time of Epiphany. v. 1-12.
 120. Of Wednesday of Nineveh, and of Supplications. 13-21.
 121. Of Sunday before Nativity. 2 John 1-13.
 122. Of John the Evangelist. 3 John 1-15.
 123. Of any day. Jude 1-13.
 124. Of the revelation of Joseph. Jude 14-25.

Pauline Epistles.

1. Lesson of the Nativity of our Lord, and for any day. Romans i. 1-12.
 2. Of the second Friday of the Fast. 13-25.
 3. Of the second Saturday of the Fast. 26-32.
 4. Of the third Monday of the Fast. ii. 1-13.

5. Of the third Tuesday of the Fast.	Romans ii. 14-27.
6. Of the third Wednesday of the Fast.	28-iii. 18.
7. Of the third Thursday of the Fast, and of martyrs.	iii. 19-31.
8. Of the third Friday of the Fast.	iv. 1-12.
9. Of the third Saturday of the Fast.	13-35.
10. Of the second Monday of the Fast.	v. 1-11.
11. Of the first Saturday of the Fast.	12-21.
12. Of Monday <i>in albis</i> , and of baptism.	vi. 1-11.
13. Of the sixth Monday of the Fast.	12-23.
14. Of Tuesday of Hosannas.	vii. 1-13.
15. Of Wednesday of Hosannas.	14-25.
16. Of dawn of Great Sunday of the Resurrection, and of the departed.	25-viii. 11.
17. Of Passion Tuesday.	viii. 12-27.
18. Of martyrs.	28-ix. 5.
19. Of the annunciation of Zacharias.	ix. 6-21.
20. Of the commemoration of strangers.	22-29.
21. Of the entering, and of the prophets and of the apostles.	30-x. 4.
22. Of the middle of Pentecost.	x. 5-21.
23. Of the Tuesday of Passion, and of the prophetic night.	xi. 1-12.
24. Of the Sunday of Hosannas.	13-24.
25. Of the feast of the Tabernacles.	25-36.
26. Of the first Monday of the Fast.	xii. 1-21.
27. Of the first Tuesday of the Fast, and when tribute is exacted.	xiii. 1-10.
28. Of the first Wednesday of the Fast.	11-xiv. 8.
29. Of the first Thursday of the Fast.	xiv. 9-23.
30. Of the first Friday of the Fast.	xv. 1-13.
31. Of the second Sunday of the Fast.	14-21.
32. Of any day.	22-33.
33. Of the time of salutation, and of holy women, and of confessors.	xvi. 1-27.
34. Of the third hour of Friday of the Crucifixion.	I Corinthians i. 1-17.
35. Of matins of Friday of the Crucifixion.	18-ii. 9.
36. Of the first Sunday after Pentecost.	ii. 10-16.
37. Of the second Sunday after Pentecost.	iii. 1-15.
38. Of the third Sunday after Pentecost.	16-iv. 5.
39. Of the fourth Sunday after Pentecost.	iv. 6-16.
40. Of the fifth Sunday after Pentecost.	17-v. 5.
41. Of the second Sunday after Resurrection.	v. 6-13.
42. Of the sixth Sunday after Pentecost.	vi. 1-11.
43. Of the second Tuesday of the Fast.	12-20.
44. Of the second Wednesday of the Fast.	vii. 1-24.
45. Of holy women and of (female) martyrs.	25-40.
46. Of the second Thursday of the Fast.	viii. 1-ix. 12.
47. Of Father Antonius and his fellows.	ix. 13-27.
48. Of the oblation of Epiphany.	x. 1-13.
49. Of matins of Thursday of Mysteries.	14-xi. 2.

50. Of the translation of the Mother of God.	I Corinthians xi. 3-22.
51. Of the oblation of Thursday of Mysteries, and of any day.	23-34.
52. Of the Sunday of Pentecost.	xii. 1-13.
53. Of the fifth Monday of the Fast.	14-27.
54. Of the commemoration of the apostles.	28-xiii. 3.
55. Of the mysterious washing.	xiii. 4-xiv. 4.
56. Of the second time of genuflexion.	xiv. 5-19.
57. Of the third time of genuflexion.	20-33.
58. Of the Sunday after Pentecost.	34-40.
59. Of matins of the Sunday of Resurrection.	xv. 1-19.
60. Of the oblation of Resurrection.	20-33.
61. Of the departed.	34-49.
62. Of the departed.	50-58.
63. Of the fifth Sunday after Epiphany.	xvi. 1-14.
64. Of Tuesday the middle of the Fast.	15-24.
65. Of matins of the Saturday of the Annunciation.	2 Corinthians i. 1-7.
66. Of the fourth Sunday after Epiphany	8-22.
67. Of the middle Thursday of the Fast.	23-ii. 11.
68. Of the consecration of the chrism.	ii. 12-iii. 3.
69. Of Basilus and Gregorius.	iii. 4-18.
70. Of the third Sunday after Epiphany.	iv. 1-6.
71. In commemoration of martyrs.	7-18.
72. Of Julianus Saba and his fellows, and of deceased strangers, and of the departed, and of the middle Saturday of the Fast.	v. 1-10.
73. Of New Sunday.	11-19.
74. Of the Sunday when the Fast enters, and of Supplications.	20-vi. 10.
75. Of the fifth Sunday after Pentecost.	vi. 11-vii. 3.
76. Of the sixteenth Sunday after Pentecost.	vii. 3-16.
77. Of the eleventh Sunday of Pentecost.	viii. 1-8.
78. Of the sixth Sunday after Epiphany.	9-24.
79. Of the Wednesday the middle of the Fast.	ix. 1-15.
80. Of the sixth Sunday of the Fast.	x. 1-18.
81. Of the middle Monday of the Fast.	xi. 1-15.
82. In commemoration of Paul the Apostle.	16-33.
83. Of the fifth Tuesday of the Fast.	xii. 1-18.
84. Of Friday of the middle week of the Fast.	19-xiii. 13.
85. Of any day.	Galatians i. 1-10.
86. Of Stephen and of Cyprianus.	11-24.
87. Of John the Evangelist, and of Porphyrius.	ii. 1-10.
88. Of the fifth Wednesday of the Fast.	11-16.
89. Of the adoration of the cross.	17-iii. 14.
90. Of the annunciation of the Mother of God, and of baptism.	iii. 15-29.
91. Of the oblation of the Nativity of our Lord.	iv. 1-18.
92. Of the birth of John the Baptist.	19-27.
93. Of the the circumcision of our Lord.	28-v. 12.
94. Of the third Sunday of the Fast.	v. 13-26.

- | | |
|---|------------------------------|
| 95. Of matins of the Wednesday of Passion. | Galatians vi. 1-18. |
| 96. Of Baptism. | Ephesians i. 1-14. |
| 97. Of the sixth Sunday after Resurrection. | 15-ii. 3. |
| 98. Of Thursday <i>in albis</i> . | ii. 4-18. |
| 99. Of the second Thursday after Resurrection. | 19-iii. 12. |
| 100. Of the brilliancy of the cross. | iii. 13-21. |
| 101. Of the feast of the Ascension. | iv. 1-16. |
| 102. Of the oblation of New Sunday. | 17-24. |
| 103. Of Friday <i>in albis</i> . | 25-v. 2. |
| 104. Of the seventh Sunday after Epiphany. | v. 3-21. |
| 105. Of the fifth Thursday of the Fast, and of the customary blessing (<i>i.e.</i> , of betrothed persons) | 22-vi. 9. |
| 106. Of the tonsure of Monks. | vi. 10-24. |
| 107. Of any day. | Philippians i. 1-11. |
| 108. Of Peter and of Babula. | 12-30. |
| 109. Of dawn of Passion Wednesday. | ii. 1-11. |
| 110. Of the eighth Sunday after Pentecost. | 12-30. |
| 111. Of the ninth Sunday of Pentecost. | iii. 1-12. |
| 112. Of matins of the raising of Lazarus. | 13-iv. 9. |
| 113. Of the tenth Sunday after Pentecost. | iv. 10-23. |
| 114. Of the eleventh Sunday after Pentecost. | Colossians i. 1-8. |
| 115. Of the fourth Sunday after Resurrection. | 9-20. |
| 116. Of the third Thursday after Resurrection. | 21-ii. 5. |
| 117. Of midday of the Friday of Crucifixion. | ii. 6-15. |
| 118. Of the fourteenth Sunday after Pentecost. | 16-23. |
| 119. Of Wednesday <i>in albis</i> . | iii. 1-17. |
| 120. Of the fifth Saturday of the Fast, and of any day. | iii. 18-iv. 18. |
| 121. Of the thirteenth Sunday after Pentecost. | 1 Thessalonians i. 1-ii. 12. |
| 122. Of dawn, Saturday of the Annunciation. | ii. 13-16. |
| 123. Of the fourteenth Sunday after Pentecost. | 17-iii. 13. |
| 124. Of Baptism. | iv. 1-12. |
| 125. Lesson of the departed. | 13-v. 11. |
| [126.] Of the fourth Sunday of the Fast. | v. 12-28. |
| 127. Of vespers of Epiphany. | 2 Thessalonians i. 1-12. |
| 128. Of the eighth Sunday after Pentecost, and of the feast of the victorious cross. | ii. 1-14. |
| 129. Of the nineteenth Sunday after Pentecost. | 15-iii. 18. |
| 130. Of the fifth Friday of the Fast. | 1 Timothy i. 1-20. |
| 131. Of supplications. | ii. 1-15. |
| 132. Of the second Sunday after Epiphany, and of the election of bishops, and of any day. | iii. 1-13. |
| 133. Of any day. | 14-iv. 8. |
| 134. Of the fifth Thursday after Resurrection. | iv. 9-v. 16. |
| 135. Of any day. | v. 17-vi. 2. |
| 136. Of the fifth Sunday of the Fast. | vi. 2-12. |
| 137. Of the fifth Sunday after Resurrection. | 13-21. |

138. Of Aiginetios and Leontius and Mar Ephrtm the Teacher. 2 Timothy i. 1-13.
 139. Of Peter of Alexandria. 14-ii. 10.
 140. Of the fifth Thursday of the Fast. ii. 11-19.
 141. Of the fourth Friday. 20-iii. 9.
 142. Of the blessed Saura. iii. 10-15.
 143. Of the obsequies of bishops. 16-iv. 8.
 [144.] Of Gregorius, servant of the Ladies (ܡܪܝܡܐ). iv. 9-22.
 145. Of election of Priests (or, elders). Titus i. 1-ii. 10.
 146. Of the Sunday after Epiphany. ii. 11-iii. 7.
 147. Of any day. iii. 8-15.
 148. Of any day. Philemon 1-24.
 149. Of matins of the Nativity of our Lord. Hebrews i. 1-ii. 4.
 150. Of the first station of the night of Friday of the Crucifixion. ii. 5-13.
 [151.] Of the Mother of God. 14-iii. 13.
 [152.] Of the Saturday of Rest. iii. 14-iv. 13.
 153. Of the second station of the night of Friday of the Crucifixion. iv. 14-v. 11.
 154. Of the night of Passion Monday, and of baptism. v. 12-vi. 8.
 155. Of humiliations and of mournings, and of any day. vi. 9-20.
 156. Of the Mother of God, and of the going up. vii. 1-17.
 157. Of Tuesday *in albis*. 18-28.
 158. Of the Mother of God, and of the consecration of a church. viii. 1-13.
 159. Of the dedication of a church. ix. 1-10.
 160. Of the third station of the night of Friday of the Crucifixion. 11-15.
 161. Of dawn, Thursday of Mysteries. 16-28.
 162. Of the third Sunday after Resurrection. x. 1-14.
 163. Of the blessing of the waters of the night in Epiphany. 15-25.
 164. Of baptism. 26-38.
 165. Of matins of Passion Tuesday, and of the fathers. 39-xi. 7.
 166. Of dawn, Tuesday of Passion, and of the prophets. xi. 8-22.
 167. Of the slaughter of the children. 23-31.
 168. Of martyrs and confessors, and obsequies and mournings, and fathers and teachers. 32-xii. 2.
 169. Of a time of wrath, and of Job the righteous. xii. 3-11.
 170. Of supplications, and of the oblation of the forty. 12-27.
 171. Of the Synod (council) of the 418 fathers of Nicæa, and of faithful kings (or, counsels). 28-xiii. 8.
 172. Of the ninth hour of Friday of Crucifixion. xiii. 9-25.

The Date of the Epistle to the Galatians, *And Certain Passages in the First Epistle to the Corinthians.*¹

BY PROF. B. B. WARFIELD, D.D.

THE determination of the exact date of the Epistle to the Galatians is one of the most delicate problems of New Testament criticism. The difficulty lies, not in the harmonizing of apparently conflicting statements or hints, but in the total lack of all plain indications one way or the other. The matter is not so much in dispute as in doubt. The proof is not only satisfactory but overwhelming that this epistle belongs with that group of great epistles — 1 and 2 Corinthians and Romans — which Paul wrote on his third missionary journey, in A.D. 57 and 58, and which in opposition to the errors of the Judaizers he made the chief vehicles of his doctrine of salvation. But as soon as it is asked where in this group it is to be placed, whether first, before 1 Corinthians, or near the end, between 2 Corinthians and Romans, — whether, in other words, its composition is to be assigned to the three years' stay of the apostle at Ephesus (A.D. 54-57) or somewhere in Macedonia during his subsequent journey from Ephesus to Corinth or even in Corinth itself (57-58), — every student finds himself immediately in a strait betwixt two. The plain fact is that this epistle is unique among Paul's letters in its entire lack of any allusion, capable of easy interpretation, to the apostle's circumstances and surroundings at the time when he wrote it. The student therefore is left to such vague and doubtful considerations to guide his decision as he would allow but subordinate weight to under other circumstances; and every slightest indication that promises to help to a doubtful conclusion is here invested with some importance, — whether it be derived from an obscure hint in the epistle itself or from a comparison of its style and lines of thought and feeling with the other letters of its group. Two such considerations have divided the opinions of recent investigators. The one, which, as the most tangible and easy of interpretation, has determined the decision of most critics, is derived from the indefinite words of Gal. i. 6: "I

¹ Read in December, 1884.

marvel that ye are *so quickly* removing from him that called you," from which the inference is drawn that the epistle must have been written soon after the apostle had left Galatia. Thus, these critics¹ have been led to place the writing of the letter at Ephesus, and to give it the first place in its group. The other, which has of late, in the train of Bishop Lightfoot's admirable argument in its behalf,² been obtaining an ever-increasing following, is derived from the close resemblance of Galatians to Romans and 2 Corinthians, from which it is inferred that it belongs with them in time as well as in character. Thus, these critics³ have been led to place its composition in Macedonia or at Corinth, and to interpose it between 2 Corinthians and Romans.

Neither of these dispositions is anything more than provisional. The inferences on which they rest are alike insecure; and each is adopted by its advocates only in the absence of decisive considerations either way. When grains are weighed against grains, a hair may tip the scales. The οὕτως ταχέως of i. 6 is clearly sufficiently consistent with a date for the epistle only a little more than three years after Paul's leaving Galatia, and, therefore, with the theory that it was written in Macedonia in 57. On the other side, the resemblances of this epistle with 2 Corinthians and Romans, while such as constitute ample proof that it was written about the same time with them, are not such as will prove absolute contemporaneity, and in the case of those with 2 Corinthians are not such as even suggest the order of composition. The likenesses coëxist with equally marked differences, which suggest either lapse of time, or at least great changes of circumstances. Prof. Jowett appears to have correctly stated the matter in the words: "The similarity and dissimilarity between the two epistles [to the Galatians and to the Romans] are of that kind which tends to show that the Epistle to the Galatians could not have been

¹ These are such as De Wette (in his *Einleitung*, Ed. 4), Olshausen, Usteri, Winer, Neander, Guerike, Meyer, Wieseler, Davidson (1849), Lange, Schaff, Reuss, Alford, Turner, Riddle, etc. Dr. Jowett, though not decisively, also takes this view in Ed. 1, vol. i.

² *St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*, etc. By J. B. Lightfoot, D.D. Andover (Draper): 1870, pp. 42 sq.

³ So, De Wette (in his *Commentary*, hesitatingly), Bleek, Credner, Howson (Com. in *The Bible Commentary*), Conybeare, Sanday, Davidson (1882), Farrar, etc. Even the most popular publications are following the lead of Dr. Lightfoot: cf. a volume printed by the Tract Society, *Lectures on the New Testament* (1881), "Galatians," pp. 7 and 10; and another by The Presbyterian Board of Publication, *The Westminster Question Book* for 1885 (1884), p. 8.

written either after or contemporaneously with the Epistle to the Romans, and that it was not, therefore, a compendium of it; nor is it probable that it was written very long before it." "A similar inference may be drawn from the relation of the Epistle to the Galatians to that [the second] to the Corinthians."¹ The resemblances are thus clearly sufficiently consistent with a date for the Galatians shortly before the apostle left Ephesus.² Whether, therefore, we accept the one conclusion or the other, we do it hesitatingly and with a feeling that the scale scarcely turns to the one side rather than the other.

In this state of affairs, critics are in search of hairs that will tip the beam. Dr. Lightfoot has brought forward two to throw into the scale for the later date: the one derived from the history of St. Paul's personal sufferings, with which he supposes the hints in these epistles to agree best if they are taken in the order, Corinthians, Galatians, Romans; and the other from the development of the Judaistic controversy, which, in like manner, he supposes to be best explained by assuming the same order. Both points appear, however, to be somewhat strained. Baur has set forth an order of development for the controversy with the Judaizers, which requires the epistles to follow the sequence, Galatians, Corinthians, Romans, and which is no less or more likely than that defended by Dr. Lightfoot. In truth, however, any such arrangement is of more than doubtful propriety, and must proceed on the covert assumption—and, we may add, manifestly erroneous assumption—that the Judaizing heresy had reached, at the same point of time, the same stage of development everywhere. So soon as we remember that some of these epistles were written to enlightened Corinth, and others to barbarous Galatia, all these nice arrangements are seen to be the growth of misunderstanding. The

¹ *The Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians, Galatians, Romans, etc.* By Benjamin Jowett, M.A. London (Murray): 1855. Vol. i., p. 202.

² The resemblances to Romans are most fully set forth by Dr. Lightfoot, as quoted above. Perhaps Dean Howson has most fully set forth the resemblances to 2 Corinthians in the introduction to Galatians in *The (Speaker's) Bible Commentary*. When Dr. Lightfoot writes, p. 55, "I cannot but think that the truths which were so deeply impressed on the apostle's mind, and on which he dwelt with such characteristic energy on two different occasions, must have forced themselves into prominence in any letter written meanwhile," we feel doubtful whether he has, in the present application of these words, sufficiently considered that the intermediate letters were written to a different community, that those truths made prominent in Galatians and Romans were not new to the apostle, and that they are as prominent as the occasion seemed to allow in both 1 and 2 Corinthians.

difference of Paul's treatment of the matter in these several epistles is, of course, due to the different states of affairs in these several churches; and so much as to speak, with this narrow reference, of the "progress of the controversy" is to introduce incongruous elements into the discussion. Paul was not a learned controversialist settling a theological controversy for the eye of the learned world, but a distressed pastor confuting error in his churches, — and for each church its own error. It would be more to the point if it could be shown that this order of epistles falls in more naturally with the hints dropped in them of the course of the apostle's personal sufferings. Unfortunately, however, the case is not so. The allusions to his sufferings which Paul makes in Galatians range most closely with those made in 1 Corinthians, and this, indeed, is apparent from Dr. Lightfoot's presentation of the matter. The state of uncertainty in which the balance swung does not appear, therefore, to be essentially altered by these new considerations.

The object of the present paper is to bring its hair to be thrown into the opposite scale. There are a few obscure allusions in the First Epistle to the Corinthians which, taken together, seem to raise a probability in favor of the priority of Galatians to that epistle sufficient to determine our opinion. These allusions seem to have been heretofore overlooked. They are not asserted to be demonstrative; but, in the nice balance in which the question hangs, they are thought to be worth adducing. And, unless we mistake, when taken together they raise a stronger probability than has as yet been made out in either direction. Before we proceed to them, however, it will be well for us to inquire what can be known of the condition of the Galatian churches at the time of Paul's second visit to them. The settlement of this question is not, indeed, necessary to the validity of the inferences we are to draw from the allusions in 1 Corinthians, but it will add new strength to them.

The Galatian Churches at Paul's Second Visit.

Commentators and historians seem to have been sometimes rather rash in their inferences as to the state of the Galatian churches, at the time of the apostle's second visit (Acts xviii. 23). There appear to be only five passages, which can be with any likelihood adduced as bearing on the matter; and no one of these speaks with unwavering voice. One of them, indeed (Gal. v. 3), may be at once set aside

as in every probability not referring at all to a former visit;¹ it is rather a strong asseveration, repeating, and at the same time broadening, the foregoing verse. We have left, then, only four passages, all of doubtful import. Acts xviii. 23 merely tells us that Paul "went through the region of Galatia and Phrygia in order, establishing all the disciples," — a phrase which does not go very far in this matter, but which does not suggest that Paul found any serious heresies at work there.

The reference of Gal. i. 9 is not entirely obvious. Some have understood it to refer only to ver. 8,² though the contextual argument strongly suggests a reference to a previous occasion, when the apostle and his companions had made this proclamation.³ Most expositors⁴ at once assume that the second visit is meant, and infer that there was, therefore, at that time a tendency already visible, or a temptation already working towards Judaizing. There is nothing in the context, however, to suggest this. On the contrary, the surrounding verses would rather lend color to the feeling that the apostle is adducing here a prophetic warning, — just as at Miletum he prophetically warned the Ephesian elders of the errors which he himself had to oppose at a later day. There is certainly nothing in the context to suggest a distinction between the first and second visits. Von Hofmann, accordingly, understands⁵ the first visit to be here meant, and argues that the apostle would never have spoken of the second visit as distinguished from the first by a simple *πρό*, especially if the warning had been called out by a serious tendency in the churches to listen to another gospel. The apostle had had experience enough, he adds, of the Judaizers at Antioch to suggest to him the need of such a warning. This much is at least worth our careful attention: the apostle actually says only "on a former occasion," and leaves it, apparently as a matter of small moment, to the knowledge of the reader, to supply the closer definition.

The passage at Gal. iv. 16, "So, then, have I become your enemy by telling you the truth?" is with even more doubtful justice applied to the second visit. The context suggests no such definition of time; and the reference has actually been taken to the time of writing⁶ and

¹ So, *e.g.*, Ellicott, Lightfoot, Alford, Eadie, Schaff, Sanday. Contra: Meyer, Sieffert, Schmoller.

² So, Chrysostom, Bengel, Winer, Neander.

³ See this well stated in Ellicott.

⁴ *E.g.*, Ellicott, Meyer, Lightfoot, Alford, Eadie, Schaff, Sieffert, Sanday.

⁵ *Die heilige Schrift neuen Testaments*, etc., ii. 1, p. 15, 2d edition.

⁶ Jerome, Luther, Koppe, Flatt.

to the first visit as well as to the second¹ visit. The commentators appear to have seriously misunderstood the purport of the verse, however, when they explain it as a declaration, that the apostle had some time or other severely blamed the Galatians. Both notions, that the truths he had told them were disagreeable, and that they were about the Galatians, are gratuitously brought into the passage by the expositors. If we observe the emphasis of ἐχθρός, and the tense of γέγονα, we will see that a fair paraphrase of the passage would be something like this: "So, then, is it an enemy of yours that I have become, by dealing² truly with you?"³ or even "So, then, is it an enemy of yours that I have become by proclaiming the truth to you?"⁴ Here is no distinction between what the apostle had been to them and what he now is; or between what he had been once, and had not been on another occasion,—no hint of a change in him. The contrast is between what he has been and is to them, and what the Judaizers are to them. Only if the context demanded a contrast between what the apostle had been to them on two previous occasions, could the ordinary interpretation be right. So far, however, from suggesting that, on his last visit, he had been harsh, the context emphatically states that he had been tender to them (vers. 18, 19). On the other hand the succeeding verses do suggest a contrast between Paul's dealing with them and the conduct towards them of the Judaizers. The verse, then, in all probability, does not distinguish times, but asserts that he had been always—and was now, as much as ever (vers. 18–20), despite appearances—true to them, while the Judaizers were self-seeking and designing.⁵

¹ Ellicott, Lightfoot, Meyer, Alford, Eadie, Sanday, Schmoller, Riddle, Schaff.

² Compare the Revised English Version of 1881, marginal reading.

³ Compare Revised English Version, 1881, American appendix.

⁴ Compare Grimm's *Clavis*, *sub. voc.*, and Eph. iv. 15, where only elsewhere in the New Testament the word occurs. It is certainly striking that in both passages the word is used in contrast to false teaching. In our own opinion, this is the true sense here; and the reference is to the *preaching* of truth.

⁵ Holsten's very valuable note on this passage escaped our eye until after the above was written; he alone of the commentators appears to have correctly caught the sense: "Paulus gibt mit diesen Worten das an, was aus der ersten seligpreisung der Galater unter der bearbeitung der judaisten, der sie unversündig gehör gegeben, in der gegenwart herauskommen ist (γέγονα). Die judaisten hatten den Galatern den Paulus als feind geschildert, der durch sein evangelium sie um die sohnschaft Abrahams und das vollerbe des heils bringen werde, wenn sie nicht dem evangelium der judaisten gläubig gehorsamen und gesetz und beschneidung auf sich rechnen würden; die Galater aber hatten die judaisten geglaubt. Und weil Paulus in v. 16, mit den Worten: *euer feind* den aussprach

Finally, Galatians v. 21 bears on its face the absence of temporal definition. The apostle simply says he had on a former occasion given the same forewarning that he now repeats. Nor are the sins of this catalogue sufficiently unlike those of Romans xiii. 13 or 2 Corinthians xii. 20 to justify our finding in them any such special reference to the condition of the Galatians that we may assume that they were in evil case when the apostle visited them the second time and that this warning was then delivered. No doubt these particular sins were chosen for condemnation, because they were specially applicable to the Galatians. But it is safe neither on the one hand to assume that the apostle gives here a *verbatim* report of his previous warning, nor on the other to assert that the character of the Galatians was not sufficiently evident during his first visit to suggest such a warning. "This solemn censure," says Dr. Eadie, "might be given at any of his visits, for it fitted such a people at any time."

It produces an almost ludicrous effect on the mind to remember that these passages are absolutely the whole basis of fact for the very detailed descriptions of the sad condition of affairs at Galatia at the time of Paul's second visit which some writers have wrought out. Even the more cautious accounts of such commentators as Meyer and Lightfoot appear scarcely justified. At the most, even when we apply the hints of Galatians i. 9 and v. 21 to the second visit, we learn nothing further than that the apostle felt constrained to *forewarn* them then against divisions and strifes, and, probably also in the way of forewarning, to put them on their guard against other gospels than that he preached. There is a complete lack of anything that will justify us in asserting it to be even probable that the Judaizing heresy had already broken out, or even that unhealthy symptoms threatening the purity of the church had already appeared or that there was an inclination to yield to them apparent. When Reuss¹ takes refuge in the broad statement that the Galatians could not have understood their letter at all, had not Paul been discussing the same matters with them immediately before orally, the attentive student will not need to have it pointed out to him that nothing could be more mistaken, — and that nothing is presupposed in the letter beyond what must have

der judaisten über ihn aufgenommen hat, wie die Galater wol verstehen, so kann er nun (v. 17), unvermittest auf diese judaisten übergehen und die selbstsucht ihrer beweggründe den Galatern enthüllen." — *Das Evangelium des Paulus dargestellt von C. Holsten*, i. 1, p. 116. Berlin, 1880. With this we very heartily agree.

¹ § 85 of *History of the N. T., E. T.*, by E. L. Houghton, Boston, 1884.

been well known in every community, where Jewish and Gentile believers existed together.

And if this is all we can learn concerning the condition of the Galatians at the time of the second visit, even if we apply both passages to that time, we are in a condition to estimate what we know of it in the actual state of doubt as to the true temporal reference of those passages. This much may be asserted as scarcely liable to contradiction: that the very indeterminate nature of the passages is itself a disproof of the theory which supposes a great change to have passed over Galatia between the apostle's first and second visits there. It is little short of incredible that he could have written so indefinitely if his second visit had been essentially different from his first. The broad *προ*- of i. 9 and v. 21, in other words, is an authoritative charter granting a monopoly to the opinion that the whole of the apostle's dealing with the Galatians up to his writing of this letter had been of one kind,—that he was conscious of no marked differences in their circumstances, demanding a marked difference in his treatment of them at his second visit,—and therefore that these churches were not in any essential danger at his visit at Acts xviii., which was not already threatening them at Acts xvi. The calm language of Acts xviii. 23 is in harmony with this inference.

Other hints in the letter to the same purport are not wanting. The fall of the Galatians is represented as a sudden and unexpected one (iii. 1, i. 6). The apostle writes the letter under shock and surprise (i. 6). The statements of iv. 18–20 appear to distinctly assert that when last present with them he had not had occasion to be harsh. Davidson well says: "The information [concerning the heresy of the Galatians] occasioned an outburst of righteous indignation. . . . The information was therefore unexpected."¹ Even Reuss admits that "the transformation . . . had come to the knowledge of the apostle suddenly, and . . . astonished him."² When we add to these notices and hints the fact that the epistle nowhere gives indication that the apostle had opposed or combated these evil tendencies when in Galatia, the probability rises very high that that very numerous body of critics³ are right who assume that the inroads of the Judaizers began only after the second visit.

¹ Introduction to the N. T. 1st Ed. London: 1849. Vol. II., p. 296.

² As above.

³ *E.g.*, Davidson (as above, p. 307); De Wette (*Einleitung*, Ed 4); Schaff (*Hist. of Apost. Church*); Bleek.

Two inferences follow from this conclusion of sufficient interest to warrant stating them. 1. We must put the composition of the epistle as late as other indications will allow. Some time, after all, even though an amazingly short one for so great a change, must be allowed for the machinations of the Judaizers to develop themselves and spread through these churches. The epistle was not, then, written at the beginning of the stay in Ephesus, but most likely only at the end of it, or after the departure for Corinth. 2. Since we must assume that the apostle wrote immediately on hearing of the evil case into which the churches had drifted, any allusions which we may find to the Galatians as heretics are allusions to the Epistle to the Galatians, and presuppose its existence.

Bearing these results in mind, we are in a position to estimate at their highest value the faint allusions, which we think we have found in 1 Corinthians, to the Epistle to the Galatians as already existing.

Allusions in 1 Corinthians.

There is, of course, but one passage in 1 Corinthians in which Galatia is explicitly mentioned, — that found at xvi. 1: "But concerning the collection for the saints: as I gave order to the churches of Galatia so do ye, — on the first day of the week let each of you lay by him in store," etc. Here is not only an implication, but a direct assertion, of communication between the apostle and the Galatians. But nothing is said as to the time when the apostle gave this command. It is not very probable, however, that he is referring in this simple manner to a command given so long ago as three years before, when he was personally with them. And this is somewhat supported by the fact that, at the time when Paul wrote 1 Corinthians and thereafter, this collection was much in his thoughts, while there is no proof that he had it in mind three years before. We are glad to see that Bishop Lightfoot¹ agrees that some time subsequent to Paul's second visit to Galatia is probably referred to in these words. But if we thus assume, as appears most natural, that Paul had personal communication with the Galatian churches shortly before he wrote 1 Corinthians, — *i.e.*, late in his stay at Ephesus, — a faint probability is raised that this occurred when he sent the epistle to them. So early a writer as Capellus, followed by Burton, saw this, and assumed that

¹ *Commentary on Galatians*, p. 32. So also Prof. Jowett, l. c. I., p. 196. At p. 60, Dr. Lightfoot supposes this communication to have taken place only just before 1 Corinthians was written.

Paul gave this command through the messengers who bore his letter. It does not seem to be a valid objection to this, that the command here alluded to is not actually found in the epistle. It was somewhat of a custom with Paul to leave personal matters to the oral communication of the bearers of his letters;¹ and this would be especially appropriate in the case of the fiery and tumultuous letter to the Galatians. And there are hints in the letter, or, at least, general instructions, to which such an oral command would be a fit supplement, and which, in a way, prepared the way for it (ii. 10 and vi. 6-10). On the other hand, there are difficulties in the way of supposing that the apostle was in constant communication with Galatia during his three years' stay at Ephesus. It is almost inconceivable that the Judaizing heresy there did not require most of this time for its development, and quite inconceivable that Paul should be in close communication with the churches and not be informed of what was toward. The tone of surprise of his letter sufficiently proves that he was wholly unprepared for the bad news when it did reach him, and this apparently indicates that he had not heard from the Galatian churches for some time previously. Of course, it is possible that Paul sent this command by a special messenger from Ephesus, and only heard from him, on his return to him in Macedonia, of the sad state of affairs in Galatia, and then was led to write the letter. A hundred other suppositions may be possible; and, in the presence of any decisive considerations one way or the other, this passage could raise no probability in opposition to them. But we are here weighing the faintest indications, and it appears easier to suppose that he sent the command by a messenger whom we know he did send, than to invent a special and additional messenger for it.² As a mere balance of probabilities, then, it seems to remain as rather the likelier hypothesis *per se* that Paul sent the command by the bearer of the letter. Of course

¹ Cf. 1 Corinthians iv. 16; Ephesians vi. 21 sq.; Colossians iv. 7.

² If the common appeal to 2 Corinthians viii. 10, ix. 1, 2 to show that the collection was taken up first of all churches at Corinth, and that, a year only before 2 Corinthians was written, were justified, it would be almost demonstrated that Galatians was written just before 1 Corinthians. (See Dr. David Brown's note on 1 Corinthians xvi. 1 in Schaff's *Popular Commentary*.) For 1 Corinthians would presuppose, then (xvi. 1), a communication to the Galatians less than a year before (2 Corinthians viii. 10), conveying a command as yet unfulfilled. But the language of 2 Corinthians viii. 10, ix. 1, 2 is strained in this application of it. It only says that the Corinthians preceded the Macedonians in this matter, and took up their collection the previous year, *i.e.*, after 1 Corinthians, which was hence probably written before passover.

this would give way before any evidence that the letter was written after 1 Corinthians; but in the absence of such evidence the probability is tangible, and if any further hints can be found in 1 Corinthians pointing to the priority of Galatians, it will become strong.

Such a further hint appears to be possibly lurking in the somewhat obscure passage, 1 Corinthians ix. 2: "If to others I am not an apostle, yet to you at least I am." The apostle is commending the law of love to the Corinthians, and is appealing to them to embrace it by his own example. To enhance the value of this example he points out that he is free from all and an apostle. The mere assertion of this is enough for his present argument. But the presence of Judaizers (the Peter-party) at Corinth leads him to pause to prove it. Is it wrong to see in the tone he adopts in this proof a deeper and more serious worry than the stage of the Judaizing controversy at Corinth gave occasion for? At all events, in the midst of it he, quite needlessly for his purpose in this general context, introduces an allusion to certain others who denied his apostleship. This *ἄλλοις* — which, moreover, is emphatically put forward — has been quite a puzzle to commentators. Hofmann and Holsten wish (plainly wrongly) to understand the dative to express relation, rather than judgment, and the *ἄλλοις* to refer to believers not converted by Paul, — the Jewish-Christian party, or, as Hofmann prefers to say, with a reference to the arrangement reported in Galatians ii. 7-8, the Christians of the Circumcision. Meyer sees in it a reference to the strangers who, non-Corinthians themselves, had brought Judaizing doctrines to Corinth. Certainly they were non-Corinthians, — but why "who had come to Corinth"? There is no hint in the passage of this, and it seems inconsistent with the emphasis that falls on *ἄλλοις* in contrast with *ὑμῖν*. Moreover, as the *ὑμῖν* are here not individuals, but a church, *ἄλλοις* should be a church, or churches, too. Briefly, then, here is a reference, in a passage the tone of which betrays strong feeling, to some other church or churches than the Corinthians, which denied Paul's apostleship. We immediately think of the Galatians, who alone, so far as we know, were before the Corinthians affected with this form of Judaizing error. It may add an additional plausibility to this supposition to note that this passage, 1 Corinthians ix. 1 sq. (especially verse 11), has some points of resemblance with a passage in Galatians (v. 6-8). Holsten has also pointed out that the use of the phrase "Am I not free?" here (verse 1) finds its explanation in Galatians ii. 4, 5. On the whole a reference to the heresy of the

Galatians, which implies, as pointed out above, the epistle, seems somewhat likely here.

Another passage of somewhat like character meets us at 1 Corinthians vii. 17, where Paul after broadening the rule suggested in verses 8-16 into the general principle that each man is to continue in the condition in which God has called him, says that he thus commands in all the churches, and immediately illustrates it from circumcision, inevitably suggesting to us the words at the end of Galatians (vi. 15) : "For neither is circumcision anything, nor uncircumcision ; but a new creature " (*cf.* also Galatians v. 6), which is very closely related to verse 19 of this chapter : "Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing ; but a keeping of God's commandments." Apparently when the apostle speaks of commanding other churches, his mind goes back to the Galatians and he remembers what he has written to them. This is natural if we assume that he had just completed the Galatian letter when he was called upon to write 1 Corinthians. And the very naturalness of the result of such an assumption raises a probability in its favor.

Still another passage of similar character is worth adducing. It is found in 1 Corinthians iv. 17. The apostle beseeches the Corinthians to imitate him in his freedom from party-spirit, and tells them that he sends Timothy to them for the very purpose of enabling them to be the better imitators of him in his devotion to others and his inability to become a party leader. Hence Timothy will remind them "of all his ways that are in Christ Jesus, even as everywhere, in every church he teaches." The strength of this doubled universal is certainly significant. And we may suppose that Paul had, under some temptation to the opposite conduct, lately taught some church something that involved the refusal on his part to appear as a party leader and the disapproval in them of such party strife and division. Do we not again think of the Galatians? In whom else if not them can this pointed reference find its fulfilment? But if the reference be to the Galatians, it is, in the light of what we have discovered as to the time of the origin of Judaizing among them, to the Epistle to the Galatians.

Of course, considered as proof this argument is very imperfect. What we are in search of is only some, even faint, hint to lead us in choosing between two opinions, either probable enough in itself, but neither of which has decisive evidence in its favor. The probability raised by each of the passages, which we have adduced, separately, is no doubt small. But it is worth remarking that that raised by each

is independent of all the others ; so that they are related cumulatively to one another. Apparently each raises a slight presumption in favor of the priority of Galatians to 1 Corinthians ; the probability that results from the cumulative union of 1 Corinthians ix. 2, vii. 17, and iv. 17 is large enough to be felt and estimated ; and therefore the support which these three passages taken collectively give to the most natural implication of 1 Corinthians xvi. 1 is strong enough to make that implication somewhat the most probable one, — for their union with it too is cumulative. Thrown into the trembling balance, this final presumption seems to be enough to determine the dip of the scales to the side of the priority of Galatians to 1 Corinthians. The hints conveyed in these passages apparently stretch even to another point, and suggest that Galatians is only just earlier than 1 Corinthians, — perhaps only a few weeks, scarcely many weeks.

Some supporting considerations buttressing this conclusion might be suggested. Among them are the passages resembling each other that may be turned up in the two epistles, and the list of which is capable of considerable enlarging over what the "Introductions" usually give. As an example 1 Corinthians x. 32–xi. 2 is quite worth comparing with Galatians iv. 12 *sq.* But not staying to dwell on what is already familiar, it may be well to call attention to two points connected with St. Paul's sufferings, — the one with his internal sorrow, and the other with his bodily torture, — both of which seem to fall in with the order of the epistles which places Galatians first. When Bishop Lightfoot represents the apostle's sufferings as ever increasing until he came to Troas and thence to Macedonia where they reached their climax, before Titus' coming relieved him, we cannot follow him. Paul himself says his sufferings did not cease when he reached Troas (2 Corinthians ii. 13), or even when he came to Macedonia (2 Corinthians vii. 5) ; but this is essentially different from saying that all this time they were increasing. On the contrary, such passages as 2 Corinthians ii. 4 appear not obscurely to hint that his inner sorrows were at their climax when 1 Corinthians was written, though he struggled to prevent their expression in order to spare the Corinthians. Indeed, the free expression of his past griefs in 2 Corinthians is proof enough that they were well past as he wrote, and Paul sets as the time of their greatest pressure the date of 1 Corinthians. Now, if at this time he was suffering under the stunning blow of the Galatian apostasy as well as under the evil news from Corinth, his deep grief is explained.

Again, the climax of his outer sufferings had been reached in Asia

(2 Corinthians i. 8-10). What desperate experience is here alluded to is, no doubt, not very clear. It seems obvious, however, that it is not the disturbance stirred up by Demetrius at Ephesus and recorded in Acts xix. That uproar did not bring the apostle into personal suffering, and he left Ephesus immediately afterwards. The narrative in 2 Corinthians seems to exclude any later occasion from consideration. Nothing appears in Acts or the Epistles so suitable for the reference as the allusion to the fighting with beasts, dropped somewhat incidentally at 1 Corinthians xv. 32 — there passed over lightly in accordance with the intention of the apostle recorded in 2 Corinthians ii. 4, but here in accordance with the altered character of his writing dwelt more fully upon. Indeed, the manner in which the apostle here describes his trial, almost implies that it had been already alluded to between him and the Corinthians. It is scarcely necessary to say that there exists no decisive reason for explaining away the hint in 1 Corinthians xv. 32 as if it were meant only figuratively. But if we assume that such a fighting with beasts did occur at Ephesus, the rather obscure verse at Galatians vi. 17, "From henceforth let no man trouble me: for I bear branded on my body the marks of Jesus," receives a ready explanation. And its implication that the experience was recent, accords with the supposition that Galatians was written immediately before 1 Corinthians, before the writing of which the beast-fighting had occurred. Moreover the hints in these two epistles that have been read by some as implying that the apostle was ill at the time that he wrote them, and especially the large, painfully-formed and misshapen letters with which he wrote his accustomed line or two at the end of the Epistle to the Galatians (Galatians vi. 11), are explained, if we assume that he had been thrown to the beasts shortly before these letters were written, and was still suffering from the deadly injuries then received.

In the light of these considerations we may be able to come to a provisional conclusion concerning the date of the Galatian letter. In accordance with its resemblances with Romans and 2 Corinthians, we must place its origin somewhat near the dates of those epistles. In accordance with the *οὕτως ταχέως* of i. 6, the reference of which is no doubt to the time of the conversion of the Galatians, but, conjoined with that, also to the time of his last seeing them: "I marvel that you are so quickly [after your acceptance of him and my experience of your hold upon him]" (*cf.* the context) — we must place it not too long after the apostle's second visit. In accordance with its

hints as to its place in the history of the apostle's personal suffering, external or internal, we must place it almost contemporaneous with 1 Corinthians. And in accordance with some seeming allusions to it in 1 Corinthians, we must place it before 1 Corinthians. We propose, therefore, to assume provisionally that the epistle was written at Ephesus, about or somewhat earlier than the passover time of the year, A.D. 57, and only a few weeks at most before 1 Corinthians. This conclusion is not firm ; it can be readily overturned by any real evidence to the contrary. But in the lack of decisive evidence either way, it appears to be the most probable conclusion attainable.

Servant of Jehovah.¹

Isaiah lii. 13–liii.

BY REV. R. P. STEBBINS, D.D.

I PROPOSE in this paper to inquire, and if possible to determine, who the “servant of the Lord” is who is spoken of in Isaiah, chaps. xl.–lv., and more especially in the chapters lii. 13–liii. It is not my purpose to give a history of opinions on this subject or a catalogue of writers and works which have discussed it. The results of my own study, almost entirely independent of commentaries, is what I wish to present in this paper and all I propose to offer. Were I to attempt to give a summary of criticisms and opinions, I should not only fail of doing justice to the subject, but detain you to listen to a recital of what you all know equally well with myself at least, and probably better than I do.

The main, if not the exclusive purpose of the prophet is to remove the despondency, and enliven the hopes of the captive people as the day of their deliverance is drawing near. He kindles with prophetic enthusiasm as he sees the tribes gathering, the desert becoming a garden to refresh them on their way, and Zion arising from her ruins and putting on her princely robes. The mountains and the hills break forth into singing, and all the trees of the field clap their hands to welcome back the exiles. The cypress tree grows up instead of the thorn, and instead of the bramble the myrtle tree, that their homeward journey may be pleasant and their home attractive.

The style of the writer is lofty, diffuse, and figurative. He abounds in personification especially, the most bold and impressive of all the figures of speech, and one most difficult of all to sustain at great length without occasionally lapsing into the literal style, as every one knows who has ever attempted to sustain a personification running through even a page. How much more difficult to con-

¹ Read in June, 1885.

sistently carry it through several pages, applied to different conditions.

Whether the "servant" spoken of in chaps. lii. 13–liii. is a personification or a literal use of the word is the question before me. If it is a personification, and the personification is perfectly adhered to, the work attributed to it, the feelings cherished, the sufferings endured, the hopes indulged, the sacrifices made, would still be described precisely as they would be if the "*servant*" was a real person; and it would be very difficult, if not impossible, to determine which interpretation was the correct one.

It is agreed on all sides, I believe, that this personification, if it is one, is correctly sustained throughout with but one exception, which exception is inconsistent with the "servant's" being a literal person, and indicates a personification. But whether this is a *valid exception* is a matter of dispute among writers, and I omit its consideration till a subsequent part of my paper, since other portions of this section of the prophecy may aid us in determining it.

Some critics have endeavored to bar all questions respecting the real personality of the "servant" here spoken of, by appealing to the use made of this passage by the writers of the New Testament, and by the reported sayings of Jesus himself. If the Master and his apostles have so referred to this passage as to decide the question whether the servant is a real person and not a personification, there is no more to be said on the subject by a believer in their authority in the premises. The only question which can be raised by us, therefore, is, Do they thus decide it? It is necessary, therefore, to seek a correct answer to this preliminary question.

Because passages in the Old Testament, descriptions of persons and events, are quoted and applied to persons and events in the New Testament, it does not necessarily follow that the Old Testament writer or speaker had the *same* person or event in view to which the New Testament writer or speaker applies them. It is too well known for me to discuss it, in this presence, that quotations are often made from the Old Testament by speakers and writers in the New, simply to *illustrate* the subject before them, to *enforce* the truth which they are stating, to *prove* the doctrine which they are maintaining, as well as to show that a prediction of the person or event which they are describing is accomplished. What passages are or are not thus quoted as *the fulfilment of predictions in this original meaning and intent*, I do not pause to show, but only state the *fact* of other purposes of quotations, that it may not lie in the way of a connected discussion

of my subject. I will only say, that there is no passage quoted from the section of the prophecy which I am to examine, which in the *form* of the quotation so strongly indicates that it is the literal fulfilment of a prophecy as that in Matt. ii. 15, "and he [Jesus] was there [in Egypt] until the death of Herod: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the Lord through the prophet saying, Out of Egypt did I call my son." It is not only conceded, but maintained on all sides, that what is here quoted is *not a prophecy*, but a simple *historical* statement of the fact that Jehovah had called Israel his people, when he was a child, out of Egypt, which people he calls his "son." With this passage as a typical illustration of the manner in which the New Testament writers quote and apply passages from the Old Testament, I proceed to examine the quotations made by them from the section of Isaiah now before me for interpretation.

Paul, Rom. x. 16, quotes Isaiah liii. 1, as describing fitly the slow progress which the gospel was making, "For Isaiah saith, Lord, who hath believed our report?" and John xii. 38 quotes the same passage to illustrate the unbelief of those who had heard the teachings of Jesus, using this formula, "That the word of Isaiah the prophet might be fulfilled which he spake," "Who hath believed our report and to whom hath the arm of the Lord been revealed?" This formula of quotation is not nearly as strong as that used in quoting Hosea, and is far from *proving* that the prophet had the teachings of Jesus in his mind when he spoke it. Indeed, the prophet appears to some critics to be speaking of himself and not of the "servant."

Again: Isaiah liii. 4 is quoted in Matt. viii. 17, with this formula, "And Jesus healed all that were sick: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Isaiah the prophet, saying, 'Himself took our infirmities and bare our diseases.'" This formula is not as strong as that used in quoting Hosea, which we know was only an adaptation of his language to a modern event. Besides, this is not an exact quotation of the prophet's words, showing that it was not quoted as *proof* but as illustration.

The 7th and 8th verses of chap. liii. are quoted in Acts viii. 32, 33 as a portion of scripture which the eunuch was reading when Philip fell in with him. The passages read thus:—

"He was led as a sheep to the slaughter;
And as a lamb before his shearers is dumb,
So he openeth not his mouth.
In his humiliation his judgment was taken away;
His generation who shall declare?"

And when the eunuch said to Philip, "I pray thee, of whom speaketh the prophet this? of himself or of some other?" "Philip beginning from this scripture preached unto him Jesus." Well might Philip do so without saying that the prophet had Jesus in his mind when he spoke these words, but some one who suffered for his people's aid, — a most appropriate and touching text to illustrate the sufferings of the Saviour. We probably have not all that Philip said on this occasion. We are not told that he answered the eunuch's question directly. He may have waived the question, and commenced at once to preach Jesus, as the occasion was so opportune. Ministers to-day appropriate and use passages in the New Testament with much greater freedom than Philip used this, if he did not think the prophet had Jesus of Nazareth in his mind. At all events, the language here used does not *prove*, if it may *imply*, that the prophet spoke of Jesus. Waiving, then, any positive opinion on the subject, and remitting a final decision of its application till further evidence of the prophet's use of the word "servant" is found, I proceed to examine the remaining places in which this section is quoted in the New Testament.

In Luke xxii. 37 Jesus quotes Isaiah liii. 12, "He was numbered with the transgressors" with these words, "this which is written must be fulfilled in me . . . for that which concerneth me hath fulfilment or an end"; a very appropriate application of language used of another to himself. If anything implies that the prophet had reference to Jesus, it must be found in the last clause, "for the things concerning me have an end," or "that which concerneth me hath fulfilment." The translation of this clause I do not think is a good one, and possibly our Saviour's words are not fully reported. The phrase *καὶ γὰρ τὰ περὶ ἐμοῦ τέλος ἔχει* may be freely rendered, "for indeed so my work has its end," that is, to be "numbered with the transgressors."

Peter quotes, in 1 Peter ii. 22-24, the following disconnected fragments from Isaiah liii., with this introduction, "Christ also suffered for you, leaving you an example that ye should follow in his steps. Who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth: who, when he was reviled, reviled not again; when he suffered, threatened not; but committed *himself* to him that judgeth righteously: who of his own self bare our sins in his body upon the tree, that we, having died unto sins, might live unto righteousness, by whose stripes ye are healed. For ye were going astray like lost sheep."

It will be seen at a glance that this is not a verbal quotation, and

that it is interspersed with remarks by the apostle. The language used by the prophet is strikingly descriptive of Christ, and the apostle used this sacred language in his teaching of what Christ had done for the world, to give it force and significance.

These are all the instances in which any portion of this section of the prophecy is quoted in the New Testament. It is obvious that none of these passages are so quoted and used as to *prove* that the prophet had in mind the incidents and persons to which or whom the persons making the quotations applied them. They are all appropriate expressions of a condition of suffering and trial such as our Saviour passed through, and may well have been used to describe them; but whether or not the prophet did have him in mind while writing must be determined by the general drift of his thought, the evident purpose of the previous portion of his prophecy, and the way in which he uses the word "servant," whether as a personification or of a real person; and if as a personification, what is personified; and if as a real person, who he is.

First, then, what is the general drift of thought in the previous portion of this prophecy?

The prophet's mind, as is evident from chapters xl.-lii. 12, is entirely occupied in describing the *captive Jewish people*, the desolate condition of their country, the ruins of their cities, the suffering of those carried captive, and the near approach of their release, their departure from Babylon, their journey across the country to their fathers' homes, and the rebuilding of their cities and temple, and the joy they would feel in their deliverance and rebuilt homes and cities, and replanted vineyards.

The people, the nation, are spoken of as the "Servant of Jehovah"; and their sufferings and captivity and release are spoken of under that name. The low origin of the nation, the watchful care and protection of their God, Jehovah, their unfilialness and frequent rebellions against him, and the ruin of their land, and their captivity, are described under the name of a "servant"; so, also, is their deliverance and subsequent prosperity.

Near the close of this section (chaps. xl.-lv.), the people are personified as a woman, — the mother of the nation, — as divorced for cause, as suffering in destitution (as the "servant" suffered in his exile), but to be restored, and prosperity and multitudes of children to be given her (chap. liv.). Then, as the people — both servant and handmaid — are soon to be established again in the land, the prophet, in loftiest periods, calls upon them to accept the approach-

ing deliverance with devout thanksgiving and inspired alacrity, and not linger by the way as they pass under the waving palm-branches, and behold the rejoicing hill-tops of their native land.

The nation, thus personified as both "servant" and "handmaid," is fully described in all its rebellions, exile, sufferings, release, return, and prosperity. Keeping this style of the prophet constantly in mind, there will be but little difficulty in interpreting, here and there, a sentence or paragraph which otherwise would be obscure, and in accounting for an occasional real or apparent lapse of the personification into literalism, and an apparent confusion of singular and plural pronouns, and second and third persons. I have already said that the continuation of a personification through even one page, without any violation of its use, would be difficult; much more, then, would it be so to continue it, as does this prophet, through fourteen chapters.

I have offered no *proof* that, in chapters previous to chap. lii. 13, the Jewish people are spoken of personified as a person, or "servant," and it can hardly be necessary to offer any proof of it in this presence: yet, for the sake of completeness and to give impressiveness to the opinion that the same personification of the nation is continued through chap. lii. 13–liii., I will examine the manner in which the personification is treated, as well as the fact that it is made in the previous chapters.

The nation is called the "servant" (chap. xli. 8, 9): "Thou, Israel, art my servant, Jacob, whom I have chosen, the seed of Abraham, my friend, whom I have taken from the ends of the earth, and called thee from the chief men thereof, and said unto thee, Thou art my servant . . . and I have not cast thee away. (14) Fear not, thou worm Jacob, [and] ye men of Israel, I will help thee."

Again, in chapter xlii. 1, the prophet says, "Behold my *servant*, whom I uphold; my *chosen* in whom my soul delighteth; I have *put my Spirit* upon him, and he shall bring forth judgment to the nations. . . . (6, 7) I the Lord give thee a light unto the nations, and have called thee to open the blind eyes, to bring out the prisoners out of the dungeon. . . . (16) I will bring the blind by a way that they know not . . . I will make the darkness light before them, and the crooked places straight. . . . (18) *Hear, ye deaf; and look, ye blind, that ye may see. Who is blind, but my servant? or deaf as my messenger that I sent? Who is blind as he that is at peace with me, and blind as the Lord's servant? . . . (22) But this is a PEOPLE robbed and spoiled; they are all of them snared in holes, and they are hid' in*

prison houses. (24) Who gave Jacob for a spoil, and Israel to the robbers? did not the Lord, he against whom *we* have sinned, in whose ways *they* would not walk, neither were *they* obedient unto his law. Therefore he poured upon HIM the fury of his anger, . . . and it set HIM on fire round about, yet HE knew it not; . . . HE laid it not to heart."

The prophet continues his personification in chap. xliii. 1, and says, "Thus saith the Lord that made thee, O Jacob, and that formed thee, O Israel; fear not, for I have redeemed thee. . . . (5) Fear not; I will bring thy seed from the east, and GATHER *thee* from the west: . . . (6) my sons from far, and my daughters from the ends of the earth. . . . Bring forth the *blind* people that have eyes, and the *deaf* that have ears. . . . (10) Ye are *my witnesses*, saith the Lord, and my *servant* whom I have chosen; . . . (12) there was no strange god among *you*: therefore *ye* are my *witnesses*." Through the rest of this chapter the singular and plural numbers, and the second and third persons, are very frequently interchanged, *when the same subject is spoken of* as literal or personified. "O Jacob, thou hast not honored me with thy sacrifices. . . . (24) Thou hast wearied me with *thine iniquities*. . . . (28) Therefore I will make Jacob a *curse*, and Israel a *reviling* (reproach). (Chap. xliv. 1) Yet now hear, O Jacob, my *servant*, and Israel, whom I have *chosen*, the Lord made thee; fear not, O Jacob, my *servant*, and Israel, whom I have chosen. . . . I will pour *my Spirit upon thy seed*." After sarcastically describing the making of a heathen god, he says, (21) "Remember these things, O Jacob, and Israel, for THOU art my *servant*. I have formed thee; thou art my *servant*. Thou shalt not be forgotten of me. I have blotted out as a thick cloud *thy transgressions*." Then follows a promise of deliverance by Cyrus, and the building of the waste places of Judah (chaps. xlv., xlv., xlvii.), and also of the destruction of Babylon. Nothing is said of Jacob as a "servant," or of Israel as a chosen one.

In chap. xlviii. 1 the house of Jacob is addressed, and the Lord says (10): "I have chosen *thee* in the *furnace of affliction*. (20) Go ye forth of Babylon. The Lord hath *redeemed his servant Jacob*. (xlix. 1) Listen, O isles, unto *me*. . . . The Lord hath called *me* from the *womb*. . . . He hath made my mouth a sharp sword, . . . and he said to me, Thou art my SERVANT, *Israel*, in *whom I will be glorified*. But *I* said, *I* have labored in vain; *I* have spent my strength for naught and vanity. . . . And now saith the Lord that formed *me* . . . to be his *servant*, to bring *Jacob to him again*, and that Israel be gath-

ered unto him. . . . Yea, he saith, Is it too high a thing that *thou* shouldst be my *servant*, to raise up the tribes of *Jacob* and to restore the *preserved of Israel*: I will give *THEE* for a light to the Gentiles (nations), that *THOU mayst be my salvation to the ends of the earth*. . . . Thus saith the Lord . . . to *him* whom *man despiseth*, to *him* whom the nation *abhorreth*, to a *servant* of rulers, Kings shall see and arise, princes, and they shall worship, because the Lord is faithful . . . who hath chosen thee. I have helped thee, I will preserve *thee*, and will give *thee* for a *covenant of the people*, to raise up this land, to make them inherit the *desolate heritages*. Sing, O heavens, . . . for the Lord hath comforted his *people*, and will have compassion upon the *afflicted*."

This strain of promise of deliverance and richest blessings to follow it, with the personification of the people as a woman, goes on to the 13th verse of chapter lii.,—the commencement of the section to be interpreted as to the meaning of "servant."

Though I have dwelt so long on the *attributes* and *services* and *sufferings* of the *servant of the Lord*, described in these chapters, I cannot resist the temptation to quote a few more passages respecting him in this concluding chapter (l. 1). "Thus saith the Lord: Where is the bill of *your mother's* divorcement? . . . To which of my *creditors* have I *sold you*? . . . For your *iniquities* were you sold, and for your *transgressions* was your mother put away. (4) The Lord hath given *me* the tongue of them that are taught, . . . that *I* should sustain *him* that is weary. I turned not away backward; I *gave my back to the smiters*, and *my cheeks to them that plucked off the hair*: I hid not my face from *shame* and *spitting*. . . . Who is among *you* that feareth the Lord and obeyeth the voice of his *servant*? (li. 1) Look unto the *rock whence ye were hewn*, and to the *hole of the pit whence ye were digged*. . . . The *captive* exiles shall *speedily be loosed*: for I am the Lord thy God. . . . Awake, awake, put on thy strength, O Zion. Break forth into singing, ye waste places of Jerusalem; for the Lord hath comforted *his people*, he hath *redeemed Ferusalem*."

By this examination of the previous chapters we find that the people or nation personified as a "*Servant of the Lord*," is said to be "feeble," a "worm" (xli. 14), "afflicted" (xlvi. 10; xlix. 13; li. 21), "despised," "abhorred" (xlix. 7); against whom men were "enraged," "incensed" (xli. 11; xlv. 24); he is "poor" and "needy" (xli. 17). This servant is said to be "blind" and "deaf" (xliii. 8; xlii. 16, 18, 19; xlvi. 8), the "friend of God," yet "robbed," "plun-

dered," a "spoil," "bound in prison," and "*prisoners*" (xlii. 22, 25 ; xlix. 9), "witnesses" of Jehovah (xliii. 10) ; he is given up as a "curse" and "reproach" (xliii. 28), "reviled" (li. 7), whose transgressions have vanished like a cloud, and whose "sins" like a mist (xliv. 22) ; "redeemed," taken away for "nought" (lii. 5), yet is said to be "precious," "honorable" (xliii. 4), "loved," as released from captivity in Babylon (xlvi. 20). The personified people, called Jacob and Israel, "the servant of the Lord," is said to be given up for a "spoil" because "WE have sinned against the Lord, and in whose ways THEY would not walk. Therefore, the Lord poured out upon HIM the fury of his anger and set HIM on fire, yet HE knew not ; and it burned HIM, yet HE laid it not to heart.

For similar instances of change of pronouns referring to the same subject see Hosea, chap. ix. 1-5, Rejoice not, O Israel ; "thou" ; "her" ; "they" ; "ye" ; Hosea, chap. x. 1-3, Israel is an empty vine ; "he" ; "they" ; "we" ; "us."

It will be seen at a glance that the same terms are used in describing the "servants," the personified people, in these chapters as are used in chaps. lii. 13-liii.

In two passages of the prophecy preceding (lii. 13-liii.), *Zion* is personified as a *woman*, so that we have a "*handmaid*," as well as a "servant," representing the people, and the language used in describing her will illustrate still further the language which is used of the "servant." The passages are chaps. xlix. 14-26 ; l. 1 ; and li. 10-lii. 12. She is spoken of as "*unfruitful*," "*childless*," an "*exile*," an "*outcast*," "*oppressed*," "*divorced*," "*dismissed for the sins of the people*," as having drunk the cup of the *Lord's* fury to the dregs," as "*afflicted*," "*deserted*," "*captive*," but to be "*ransomed*," "*restored*." The personified people as "*handmaid*" is represented in the same manner as when personified as "*servant*." Uniting the condition of the "*handmaid*" with that of the "*servant*," and also the terms in which her condition is described, — we have the key to the interpretation of the meaning of the prophet, when he speaks of the servant of the Lord in lii. 13-liii. But confirmation of the accuracy of this interpretation should not be omitted.

A particular examination of two other passages will render still further aid in obtaining the exact meaning of the prophet in the section referred to ; they are chaps. xlii. 1-16 and xlix. 1-13.

There would be no difficulty whatever in understanding the "servant" named in these two passages, as being the personified, ideal people, were it not that the real, captive, imprisoned, scattered people

are to be released by him, to be gathered by him. That is, the *ideal, personified* Israel would be represented as blessing and restoring, as the "servant" of God, the *real, captive* Israel. Jehovah says, "Behold my *servant*, whom I uphold; my *chosen*, in whom my soul *delighteth*; I have put my *spirit* upon him. He shall give laws to the nations. He shall not strive nor cry. . . . He shall not fail, nor become weary, until he shall have established laws in the earth, and distant nations shall wait for instruction. . . . Thus saith Jehovah. . . . I have called *thee* for deliverance; I will hold *thee* by the hand; I will defend *thee*, and make *thee* a mediator to the people, a light to the nations, to open the *blind eyes*, to bring out the prisoners from the prison, and them that sit in darkness out of the prison house. I am Jehovah, that is my name, and my glory [my chosen people] will I not give to another [nation], nor my praise [worship due me] to graven images. . . . I will show myself against my enemies, I will lay waste mountains and hills. . . . Then I will lead the BLIND in an unknown way, I will not forsake them." Such is the main course of thought in the first passage. That those in *prisons* and *bound* are the captive Israelites is made clear by the twenty-second verse: "And yet it is a *robbed* and *plundered* people, they are all of them *bound in prisons*, and hid in dungeons; they have become a spoil."

The second passage, xlix. 1-13, is of the same character, except that the servant, "who is *called at birth*, who is to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel, to be made the light of the nations, he who is *despised* by men, and *abhorred* by the people, the *servant* of tyrants," is said to be "Israel" in the third verse; and he is said to be for a "*mediator for the people*, to restore the land, to distribute the desolated inheritances, to say to the prisoners, Go forth; to them that are in darkness, Come to the light . . . for Jehovah comforteth his people, and hath compassion on his afflicted ones." We are required by this passage to adopt the interpretation that *personified, ideal* Israel is to *succor, deliver, restore* REAL CAPTIVE Israel. But if this interpretation is demanded here by the explicit statements of the text, it may be adopted in the previous passage if it meets the exigencies of the case. That the former passage refers to the same *person* or *personification*, as the latter, is made clear by his characteristics and his work. He is to lead back the people from captivity, and to establish them in the land. This complication of the figure may seem to us hard and unintelligible. It is made so, however, by the length of the passages, and by the minuteness of the description, and not by the figure itself. I will

refer to one or two brief personifications to show this. "Thus saith Jehovah, Where is the bill of your mother's divorcement, by which I dismissed her? Or, who is he among my creditors to whom I sold *you*? Behold for *your iniquities* are ye sold, and for *your transgressions* was *your mother dismissed* (l. 1). Here the mother is the personified nation, and she is represented as dismissed for the sins of the people, that is, for the sins of the nation itself as a whole. So the *ideal, personified nation is represented as suffering for the sins of the real, sinning people*; precisely the figure in the two passages named above, but not carried to such length of description as to seem awkward, confused. In chap. xl. 1, 21, Zion, the city, is personified, and represented as childless, and says to herself as she sees the people return, her children gather around her, "I surely was childless and unfruitful, an *exile and an outcast*; who then hath brought me these. Behold, I was left alone; these, then, where were they?" Here it is evident that the ideal, childless city is represented also as the captive people, for how could a literal city be an exile?

This, then, is the result of our examination respecting the use and meaning of the word "servant," or phrases, "my servant," "his servant," in this part of Isaiah, till we come to its use in the section under consideration. It *means the people of Israel, the ideal Jacob*, the nation personified. It *never* refers to a personage *yet to come*, but to *one already come*, whose work of deliverance, of instruction, is now going on, or soon to commence.

We are now ready to inquire whether any new person, or usage of the word or phrase, "servant," or "servant of the Lord," is introduced in chaps. lii. 13–liii. To aid us in determining this point, we must call to mind again the drift of the prophecy or discourse, and its harmony or discordance with what precedes, where the same phraseology is used. The section properly commences with chap. lii., 13th verse, and ends with chap. lv. From chap. lii. 13 to the end of chap. liii. is an account of the condition, sufferings, and triumph of the "*servant*" of the Lord; in chap. liv. is a description of the condition, bereavements, and blessedness of the "*handmaid*" of the Lord. Chap. lv. contains a triumphant call to the people to accept the divine deliverance, and go forth from their captivity with joy, amidst mountains and hills singing, and trees clapping their hands. With this section ends this particular form of presenting the subject. The word "servant" is not used in the rest of the book.

Let us now return to a more particular examination of the first division of the section including chaps. lii. 13–liii. The "servant"

of the Lord is represented as about to "*prosper*," to be "*exalted*," "*set on high*," and "*greatly exalted*"; as many nations as were "*amazed*" at his "*disfigured*" and "*marred visage*," so many nations shall *exult* on account of him, and *be silent* before him, for they will be *dumb* in view of his unexpected greatness. But who believes us when we say this, and who has recognized the power of Jehovah toward this nation, even among ourselves? For he, "the servant" of the Lord, *grew up unobserved* like a *tender plant*, from a *dry soil*, there was nothing *attractive* about him to awaken delight in him. He was *despised* rather, and *forsaken*, *sorrowful*, and *diseased*, and we *esteemed him not*. But he bore *our diseases* and we *esteemed him smitten of God*. But for *our transgressions* he was *wounded*, for *our iniquities* he was *bruised*, and by *his stripes* are we *healed*; we were all *straying like lost sheep*, but Jehovah *laid on him the iniquity of us all*, yet he was as a *lamb*, he *opened not his mouth*. He was taken away by *oppression*, and who of that generation would consider that he was cut off from the land of the living, that for the transgression of my people chastisement was upon *them*? He was buried with the *wicked*, with the *rich* was his sepulchre, although he had done *no wrong*. Though Jehovah did *bruise* him severely, since he gave himself a *sacrifice for sin*, he shall see *posterity*; free from his *sorrows*, he shall be *satisfied*. My *righteous servant* by his knowledge shall lead many to righteousness, whose *iniquities he bore*. Therefore will I *give him a portion with the mighty*, with *heroes shall he divide the spoil*, because he *poured out his soul unto death*, and was *numbered with transgressors*. It will be perceived that there is nothing affirmed of the "servant" here which has not been affirmed or implied of him elsewhere if we remember the force of figurative language, and that details include no more than the general statement under which they fall. The servant is *despised*, *suffers*, *dies* (as a nation), *triumphs*. That the servant here described is the personified, ideal, chosen people is distinctly hinted in the eighth verse, where it is said that "for the transgression of my people chastisement or smiting was upon *them*." I know that there is a discussion among grammarians and commentators respecting the number of the pronoun in לָמֹן, but the *common usage*, as all admit, is plural, and some of the best critics contend that it is *never* used in the singular, unless in a very few cases as a substitute for a noun of multitude, still retaining its plural meaning. Therefore, unless reasons to the contrary are most imperative, even to altering the text, the pronoun should here be taken as a plural. Some of the most able orthodox critics more than admit, they maintain this.

The "servant" of the Lord here spoken of, then, is the *personified, ideal, chosen people*; and this *personified person* is said, by the double figure noticed before as used by this writer in his personifications, to have suffered for the sins of the *real, literal* people. But blessing was in store for him, the future was all radiant with glory. The Lord would reward him for all his sufferings.

That this view may be still further confirmed, let us notice for one moment the next personification of the people as the handmaid of the Lord. She is exhorted to sing and shout; for though desolate, her children shall be more than of a married woman. "Thy posterity shall *inherit the nations and people the desolate cities*. Fear not, blush not, for thou shalt forget the shame of thy youth (*thy low origin*), and the reproach of thy widowhood (captivity) shalt thou remember no more. For thy husband is thy Maker. For as a woman *forsaken* and *deeply afflicted* hath Jehovah recalled thee, and as a wife wedded in youth that hath been *rejected*, saith God. For a little moment I have *forsaken* thee; but in mercy will I GATHER thee. I call special attention to the word *gather*, קָבַץ, which implies plurality, the *people* of which the handmaid is the personification, as in chap. xliii. 5. Fear not, for I am with thee. I will bring thy children from the east, and *gather them* from the west. In *overflowing wrath* I hid my face from thee for a moment, but with *everlasting kindness* I will have mercy upon thee; as in the time of Noah I swore, so now I swear, that I will not be angry with thee, saith Jehovah, that hath pity on thee. O thou *afflicted, beaten* with the storm, *destitute* of consolation, behold, I lay thy stones in cement of vermillion. All thy children shall be taught of Jehovah; great shall be the prosperity of thy children. No weapon shall prosper against thee."

This outline of the prophet's description shows that the "servant" and "handmaid" are the same, the *people personified*. This last passage *can* mean nothing else. They together are the climax of the prophet's endeavor to describe the sufferings and future triumphs of the chosen people of God, under the figure of a person, his servant Jacob, and he now breaks forth into an exultant appeal to the people to accept the promised deliverance, "Ho every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters."

There are some clauses in chap. liii. which seem at first view incongruous with such an interpretation. But when we remember the difficulty attending writing a long and specific personification, I do not think the incongruities referred to are very marked, at least not

sufficiently marked to raise any serious objection to this interpretation which so harmonizes with the style of the prophet elsewhere, and with the current of his thoughts both before and after the passage.

I understand, then, by the "servant" of Jehovah, in the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah, the personified, chosen people, Israel, described as suffering pain and reproaches for the sins of the real people. I do not understand the body of the prophets, or any one prophet, or the good people of Israel, though this ideal people are generally represented as good. The mere fact that the *sufferings* described *are all past* would show that a future event was not spoken of, nor a person of a future period described. Nor does the fact that the "servant" is said to be buried prove that a real person, and not the personified nation, is intended; for the prophet Ezekiel, who lived at the same time as our prophet, speaks of the *nation* as being buried, and as coming forth out of their graves to return to their own country (Ezek. xxxvii. 12). "O my people, I will open your graves, and cause you to come up out of your graves, and bring you into the land of Israel. And ye shall know that I am the Lord when I have opened your graves, O my people, and brought you up out of your graves, and shall put my spirit in you; and you shall live, and I shall place you in your own land."

Hosea uses the same bold personification (chap. xiii. 14): "I will ransom them [the people] from the power of the grave. I will redeem them from death. O death, where are thy plagues? O grave, where is thy destruction?" Isaiah expresses the deliverance of the people from captivity in still bolder language (chap. xxvi. 19): "Thy dead shall live; my dead bodies shall arise. Awake, and sing, ye that dwell in the dust. . . . The earth shall cast forth the dead." And, while I cannot press the passage as confirming my interpretation of Isaiah liii. 9, I take the liberty of quoting Daniel xii. 2. I understand the prophet to be speaking of the rescue of the conquered nation from its conquerors, and the restoration of its patriots to everlasting honor, and of its traitors to everlasting contempt: "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake; some to everlasting life, and some to everlasting shame and contempt."

As I have before stated, there are no terms used in the passage which cannot be understood of the *people* personified, as well as of a real, literal person, because a personification, so far as the use of language is concerned, is a *real, literal* person. The question is not, therefore, whether the language is appropriate to a personification, but whether it is appropriate to a person; for, if it is suitable to the latter,

it is demanded by the former. Its appropriateness to a person is self-evident, as the testimony of the great body of critics shows; it is therefore appropriate to a personification. The only question, therefore, is whether this is a personification; and this question I have attempted to answer as fully as the brief time allotted to this paper permits. There are several important matters of criticism incidentally connected with the main subject which it would be very interesting to consider, but must be omitted, as their discussion would add nothing to the force of the argument which I have presented in support of the view which I take of the passage which I have criticised.

The Date of the Korah-psalms.¹

BY PROF. C. H. TOY, D.D., LL.D.

THE difficulties of psalm-criticism are well known: the definite historical references in the psalms are few, the linguistic indications are rarely decisive, and the text is sometimes corrupt; and further the development of the Israelitish literary and religious history has not been so worked out as always to furnish trustworthy notes of date. I do not hope to be able to fix the places of the Korah-psalms with certainty, or to do anything more than state the points involved, mark out more precisely the problem, and thus possibly take one step towards its solution.

This group embraces Pss. xlii.-xlix., lxxxiv., lxxxv., lxxxvii., and possibly lxxxviii., though this last is also ascribed in the title to Heman the Ezrahite. Of the "sons of Korah" given in the titles as the authors of these psalms we know very little. Of an assumed ancestor Korah, a descendant of Levi, we have a history in Ex. vi. 21, 24, Numb. xvi., and his genealogy is given in 1 Chr. vi. 7 ff. [Eng. Vers. 22 ff.] and 18-23 [33-38]; Korahites are described as soldiers, 1 Chr. xii. 6 (but these appear to be Benjaminites, ver. 2), temple-doorkeepers, 1 Chr. xxvi. 1-19, and singers, 1 Chr. xxv., in David's time, and in Jehoshaphat's time as singers, 2 Chr. xx. 19; after the exile they appear as porters, 1 Chr. ix. 19; and as in charge of things baked, 31, but not as singers; in Nehemiah, strangely enough, considering the relation of that book to Chronicles, they are not mentioned, for in Neh. xi. 19, xii. 25 (comp. 1 Chr. ix. 17) there is no sign that the men named are Korahites. Thus the existence of a body of singers of this name depends on the book of Chronicles and the titles of the psalms, two questionable sources. The disposition of Chronicles to embellish its narratives and transfer to early times the institutions of its own would lead us to be cautious in accepting its ritual statements, and a comparison with the book of Kings tends to throw doubt on the rôle assigned by the Chronicler to the Korahites under David and Jehoshaphat. On the other hand there is no

¹ Read in June, 1885.

reason to doubt that Korahite singers existed in the Chronicler's time (c. B.C. 320-300), and if in his time, then probably earlier, though how much earlier it is hard to say, perhaps under Ezra and Nehemiah. The precise form "sons of Korah" does not occur in Chronicles: in 1 Chr. xiv. the Levitical singers are distributed under the three leaders, Asaph, Heman, and Jeduthum; but in 2 Chr. xx. 19 the double plural "sons of the Korahites" may be regarded as equivalent to the form in the psalm-title. Probably there was, from the fifth century on, a Levitical family of singers called the "Bene Korah," and they may well have been the authors or collectors and editors of temple-songs; there may have been a song-book arranged by them, containing their own productions or those of others or both of these classes, and called by their name.

But now, as to whether any particular psalm belonged to this collection or was composed by this family, on this point our only source of information is the title. And no one of the titles can be regarded as in itself authoritative, for the reason that so many of them are manifestly incorrect that the trustworthiness of the whole body is thereby impugned. This does not mean that all of them are certainly wrong, but only that we cannot be sure of any one of them, on its own word merely, that it is right. Over the titles of the psalms ascribed to David we have some control from his history as given in Samuel; for example, the situation in Pss. lx., cviii. (serious defeat) corresponds to nothing there narrated. But it may be said that the singer has in mind an incident of the Edomite war not preserved in our historical books. There are, however, other discrepancies not to be explained by a supposed silence of the history. A number of the psalms ascribed to David assume the existence of the temple, for example, lxxviii., cxvii., cxxxviii.; and of these some take for granted the later levitical life, dwelling in the temple, and worshipping with the great congregation, as xxvii., xl., lxv. Others portray such relations to foreign nations as did not exist in David's time, so vii., lvii., lix. Elsewhere we find references or allusions to the exile or to some similar great calamity, as in xiv. (and its duplicate liii.), lxix., cxv. ; or to circumstances that do not fit into any conceivable scheme of David's life, as lv. These are examples of historical difficulties that lie on the surface; if we went into a fuller examination of the history of the cultus, the case would be made stronger.

Our confidence in the titles is impaired also by the editorial modes of procedure of which we have glimpses, especially the disposition to tack together different compositions; see the appendages to li.

and cxliv.; cviii. is found in lvii. and lx.; compare the psalm in 1 Chr. xvi., identical with parts of our cv., xcvi., cvi. Further, reference to the versions shows that the titles were freely dealt with by ancient editors and scribes, and especially that there was a disposition to ascribe psalms to David. In the Septuagint the following psalms, non-Davidic in the Hebrew, are considered Davidic (the numbering is that of the Greek): xxxii., xlii., lxvi., lxx., xc., xcii.-xcviii., ciii., cxxxi.; to Haggai and Zechariah Sept. gives cxlv.-cxlviii., anonymous in the Hebrew, and to Jeremiah cxxxvi. On the other hand, cxxiii., cxxx., cxxxi., Davidic in the Hebrew, are anonymous in the Septuagint. The Greek version shows a natural desire to find authors, and it is to be supposed that the same desire was felt by the Hebrew editors. The Peshitto Syriac deals still more freely with the titles; except as to authors, it shows almost complete neglect of the Hebrew, omitting its historical statements and inserting others. Ps. xliii., it says, was composed by David when Jonathan disclosed to him that Saul sought his life, etc.; xlv. was sung by the people in Horeb with Moses, and xlv., xlvii. also were composed in the days of Moses; liii. was uttered against Ahithophel when he advised Absalom to pursue David and kill him; lxiv. was composed by David when the seer Gad instructed him not to abide in the hold, 1 Sam. xxii. 5; lxxxviii. and lxxxix relate to the people who were in Babylon. It differs from both Hebrew and Greek in the enumeration of Davidic psalms. Whence did the Syriac get its knowledge of the historical circumstances of the psalms? How did it learn that seven of its ten Korah-psalms, xlii.-xlvii., lxxxiv. (to lxxxvii. and lxxxviii. it assigns no author) were composed in the times of Moses and David? Possibly this is a mere guess on the part of the translator; or it may be a current Jewish tradition. In either case, if we suppose that the critical procedure of the Hebrew editors was similar to that of the Syrian, we shall be disposed to attach little importance to the title. It becomes a question whether "Sons of Korah" is not as doubtful a name of authorship as "David," a mere receptacle for psalms of unknown origin, possibly the name of a collection whose contents may have had no relation to the Korah-family. This, however, remains doubtful, and in any case we must have recourse to the internal evidence to determine the dates of our psalms.

1. So far as the literary style is concerned, it has little or nothing to tell us of the time and method of the composition or collection of the Korah-group. The songs show great differences in form, content, and tone: there is the tender lament of banished Levites, xlii.-xliii., lxxxiv.,

the depression of national humiliation, xlv., lxxxv., or of individual adversity, lxxxviii., the outburst of patriotic exultation, xlv., xlvii., xlviii., lxxxvii., an ode to a king and his consort, xlv., and a philosophical reflection, xlix.; and the language is now smooth and flowing, now curt and hard, or enigmatical, here the rhythmical balance is well maintained, here it is lacking. The group may have been composed at one period, if we judge from the style alone, or its composition may have extended over centuries.

2. We need not expect to find in the grammar and lexicon of the Korah-group any very definite indication of date; like the rest of the psalter, this group is written in the main in what is called classical Hebrew, the language of the prophets and the earlier historical books, and of such Hebrew we must admit the possibility from David's time to the second or first century B.C. Doubtless there are pronounced linguistic differences between the various Old Testament books: the contrast between the poetic brilliancy of Amos and Isaiah and the prosaic flatness of Haggai and Zechariah is sufficiently well marked; and in the later historical books, as Chronicles, and philosophical works like Koheleth the Aramaizing tendency is distinct. But, apart from Aramaisms, the language changed slowly; and after the exile, and especially after the idea of a sacred canon had established itself, there was a disposition to imitate earlier writers, a disposition that may be supposed to have been especially strong in liturgical productions like the psalms, in which, moreover, the thought is simple and of limited range.

The words of strange appearance that are found in the Korah-group are too few and too doubtful to be decisive guides as to date: **צנור**, xlii. 8, found elsewhere only in 2 Sam. v. 8, where its signification is unknown, has been supposed here to mean "canal," a sense that it has in Jewish Aramaic; but the connection in the psalm seems rather to favor the meaning "waterfall," as Septuagint gives it.

רחש, xlv. 2, appears to be used in the sense "gush or flow forth," as in Syriac. As it is found only here in the Old Testament, and is a common word in Syriac and Jewish Aramaic, there is some ground for supposing that it is an Aramaic loan-word; but it is manifestly difficult to make such an assertion respecting a word which occurs only once, and, if its Aramaic origin were settled, this would merely give the exile as upper limit, since Aramaizing expressions occur as early as that.

שגל, xlv. 10, "queen," is found only here and in late books, namely, Nehemiah and the Aramaic part of Daniel. It is prob-

ably due to Aramaic influence, and the same remark applies to it as to the preceding word. The verb-stem occurs in Isaiah, Deuteronomy, Jeremiah, and the second part of Zechariah, and is uniformly replaced in the margin by שׁבב; it would thus seem that the native Hebrew stem became *vox inhonesta*, while the borrowed noun, having only its dignified foreign sense, maintained its place. Still, the possibility that the noun is early Hebrew must be admitted.

יָדַבֵּר, xlvi. 4, "lead or subdue," found elsewhere in this sense only in Ps. xviii. 48, is Aramaic in form and meaning; everywhere else the stem is used in Hebrew in the sense of "speak," while in classical and Jewish Aramaic the only sense is "lead, draw, govern." Yet it remains possible that this meaning attached to the Hebrew Hifil, of which we have only these two examples.

3. In connection with xlix., it is only necessary to refer to the history of the development of speculative thought among the Israelites. This psalm belongs in the same category with the books of Job and Ecclesiastes; its solution of the problem of the prosperity of the wicked is the same as that of the three friends in Job. We might be inclined thence to infer that it is earlier than the latter; but, considering the persistence of such opinions and the diversity of individual views, it is safer to content ourselves with assigning it to the same general period. The date of Job is variously fixed by critics of the present day; probably the majority would not put it earlier than the exile. When we remember the character of the mashalic literature said in Prov. xxv. to have been edited in the time of King Hezekiah, we shall be disposed to assign to a later period the analyzing, philosophizing reflection of our psalm, though it will be difficult to determine its precise place.

4. The use of divine names in the psalms may throw some light on their dates, though this is a canon of criticism that should be employed with special caution. We may assume, it is true, substantial naturalness in such use of names, that is, there seems to be in the psalms no such dramatic writing as might lead an author (as, perhaps, in the book of Job) to put into the mouths of his speakers the forms of address proper to an earlier period; it may be taken for granted that the psalmist employs the names natural to himself and to his generation. But various names may be natural. Supposing, for example, that "Yahwe" was in process of displacement by "Elohim," the two might be employed together for a considerable period; and in liturgical hymns it would be natural for the authors to use the proper name of the God of Israel which they found in the ancient and venerated

writings of the prophets. And this is what appears to be the case in our psalter. That a process went on, after the exile, by which "Elohim" took the place of "Yahwe" may be regarded as established from several considerations. First, there is the occurrence in the Pentateuch of double or related narratives, one Yahwistic and the other Elohist, the former bearing marks of being the earlier. Then, we have parallel passages in earlier and later historical books, the latter employing "Elohim" where the former employ "Yahwe"; compare, for example, 2 Sam. v. 19, vi. 17, vii. 27, xxiv. 10 with 1 Chr. xiv. 10, xvi. 1, xvii. 25, xx. 8 respectively. And in certain books, as Ezra, Nehemiah, and Ecclesiastes, known to be late, Yahwe has almost entirely yielded to Elohim. Finally, we know that the Jews ended with entirely abandoning the former, substituting for it the Hebrew Adonai and the Greek Kurios. From the extant literature we may infer that the process of change began at least as early as the fifth century B.C.; it is already visible in the Pentateuch and in Malachi.

But it is necessary to note the precise nature of this change. It consists, of course, not merely in the use of the word "Elohim" in connection with the Deity,—this old Hebrew word was necessarily employed abundantly from the earliest times as an appellative; the essential point of the change was that "Elohim" now came to be employed as the proper name of the God of Israel, just as Yahwe was used. If we go through the preëxilic prophetic books, we shall find few occurrences of Elohim (or of El) where it is not shown to be an appellative by the presence of the article or of an adjective or other qualifying expression, or else is not clearly a general designation of the divine. In two or three cases there is a near approach to the use of the word as a proper name. Amos iv. 11: "as when Elohim overthrew Sodom" is identical in its wording with Gen. xix. 29, and Hos. xii. 4: "he strove with Elohim" with Gen. xxxii. 28. There is a similar use of "Eloah" in Hab. iii. 3: "Eloah came from Teman," though this would decide nothing as to "Elohim." But in certain of the psalms, this employment of the latter as proper name is definite and usual, and seems to show that there had taken place a change in the national feeling in respect to the designation of the God of Israel. Then, it is to be noted that this change of divine name was the result of a change in the general religious outlook. Yahwe was an individual and national name; it distinguished the Israelitish deity from the deities of other nations. There was a time when the Israelites held that the deity belonged to the soil, as the soil to the deity; so thought Jephthah (Judg. xi. 24) and David (1 Sam.

xxvi. 19). But, with broadening and deepening views of the absolute oneness of the Deity and the nullity of all pretenders to deity except the One, there doubtless came the feeling that an individual name for God savored of the old polytheism; and so the private name would give way to that general term which identified the God of Israel with the absolutely Divine. The history of the development of the religious thought would thus lead us to regard the Elohist writings as in general later than the Yahwistic. But the value of this canon is impaired by the consideration above-mentioned, that it is conceivable that, after the one name had established itself in a certain circle, a psalm-writer should use the other, or both together; the lyrical, devotional feeling might cling to the old name after the philosophical thought had dropped it. And this is not all the difficulty. The utility of this canon is further weakened by the fact that we must admit the possibility of two recensions, Yahwistic and Elohist, of the same psalm. Such a double recension exists in xiv. and liii., and may exist elsewhere. We cannot be sure, in the case of any Elohist psalm, that an editor has not changed the divine name; and therefore, we are practically debarred from pressing this point. In one place, at least, there is ground to suspect editorial change; in xlv. 8 the expression "Elohim, thy Elohim, has anointed thee" would sound more natural if it read: "Yahwe, thy Elohim, has anointed thee." Whether the change has actually been made here or not, it is possible; and all that we can with some positiveness infer from an Elohist psalm is the date of the possible recension.

5. There is another point which, if taken in connection with the preceding, may lead to more definite results: it is the ritual-ecclesiastical tone that appears in certain of the psalms; for example, in xlii., xliii., lxxiv., where a Levite or priest mourns his absence from the temple-service in which he finds his real life.

The question of the growth of the ritual, a part of the question of general Pentateuch criticism, is too wide a one to be discussed here. If, as it seems to me, we find in the closing chapters of Ezekiel the indication of the rise of the separate Levitical order, then this will be the upper limit for the composition of such psalms. The value of such a canon will depend on the definiteness with which it can be applied. The psalms above mentioned show a considerable development of temple life; the singer is at home in the house of God as he is nowhere else. He has a defined liturgical rôle, such as does not appear in Deuteronomy, and could hardly be expected earlier than the legislation of the middle books of the Pentateuch. Of this

advanced temple life there is no trace in Kings, but it appears fully formed in Chronicles. This latter book felt it to be necessary to supplement the earlier by long histories of Levitical procedures on all occasions; and the natural inference is that, between the books, the Levitical life had established itself so firmly, that it was looked on by the Chronicler as something that must always have existed. The first of the prophets who shows sympathy with the priestly cultus is Ezekiel; the first who speaks of it as established is Malachi, after whom came Joel and the second Zechariah. In connection with this we must take into account also the churchly tone that we see in xlvi., xlviii., lxxxv., lxxxvii. In the preëxilian prophets, the political conception of the people is the most prominent one; it is the nation crowned with glory and happiness by the favor of Jahwe; but above all, the nation as a political unit, with its king and territory, and all the accompaniments of sovereignty. But in later writings we find that this conception is modified. The national idea is never given up; but the nation has come to be regarded more as a community whose main life is religious, whose political position is chiefly valuable as furnishing a secure basis for the worship of God and the maintenance of his law. The contrast between the two conceptions is obvious if we go down as far as the Maccabean time; in First and Second Maccabees the ecclesiastical feeling is clear, and it appears also in the earlier books, Esther and Judith. The old hopes of military supremacy are gone; when the Jews came to realize the power of the Persians, the Greeks, and the Romans, they felt the impossibility of those visions of a Hebrew world-monarchy that had cheered the hearts of the earlier prophets. They began to content themselves with the consciousness of religious superiority, — they had the divine law, theirs was the promise of divine favor in the nobler sphere of ethical-religious supremacy. This feeling, the initiation of which appears in the Second Isaiah, was formulated by the devout scribes and doctors of the second century B.C. It would naturally show itself in a peculiarly tender feeling towards Jerusalem as the centre of the national life. Zion — this was a name that the poets specially loved, a name consecrated by the memories of the poet-king who had taken it from the aliens and made it his capital — is no longer the royal capital; it is the centre of the church; it is invested with unearthly beauty, and has become the object of passionate affection. Such a feeling as this appears in some of our psalms. See xlvi. 5-8, xlviii. 2-7, 13, 14, lxxxv. 9-14, lxxxvii. This last psalm is an ode to the sacred citizenship: Yahwe, the poet declares, loves Zion (obviously as

the seat of the cultus) more than all the dwellings of Jacob, and, in the final estimate of the nations of the earth, the determining consideration will be birth, that is, citizenship, in the sacred spot. The writer seems to have proselytes in view, — a fact that would suggest a late date.

6. The historical references are few, and far from being always definite. The mention of service in the temple gives as upper limit the building or the temple by Solomon, and excludes the period B.C. 587–515, during which it was not standing, but there then remains a sufficiently long space of time; so xlii.–xliii. (doubtless substantially one psalm, or parts of the same psalm), xlviii., lxxxiv., and probably also lxxxvii. (“sacred mountains”).

Banishment or absence from the temple, as in xlii.–xliii., lxxxiv., may, so far as it in itself is concerned, relate to various periods. In the first place, it is not certain that the absence in these cases was effected by enemies; it may have been occasioned, particularly in lxxxiv., by private circumstances having no connection with the general national history, and may thus be quite beyond our reach. And then, if it does connect itself with some public event, some persecution by native or foreign oppressors, we have the choice between such widely separated persons as Manasseh and Antiochus Epiphanes, and possibly Bagoses (Joseph. Antiq. xi. 7); we may add, perhaps, the deportations that took place just before the destruction of the city.

The apparent mention in xlv. of the marriage of a king to a foreign princess has seemed to some critics to furnish a definite note of date. In connection with such a marriage, one might think of Solomon and the Egyptian princess, of Joram of Judah and Athaliah of Israel, or indeed, of Ahab and Jezebel. Solomon is not certainly excluded by the fact that the king is described as warlike, for that feature would naturally find place in a panegyric of any ancient king; nor by the non-mention of Egypt as the bride's country, for the home of the bride is not named at all (in ver. 13, where the text is probably corrupt, the “daughter of Tyre” seems to designate the city and not the bride), and this objection applies equally to all suppositions. Athaliah's later rôle was not such as to procure her so cordial a celebration at the hands of a Judean poet, but in the beginning it may have been different. The objection to Ahab as the hero of the psalm, that the idealizing messianic portraiture could apply only to a Davidic king, is founded on a double misconception; it is an importation of later ideas into this period; there is no good ground for denying that a northern poet might have invested a northern king with the “mes-

sianic" character ; and then there is no specifically messianic picture in this psalm, nothing but praise of the king, and wishes of prosperity for him and his consort. It is possible that the mention of "ivory palaces," ver. 9, may make Ahab the upper limit, since he is the earliest king who is described as having such a palace ; but it must be confessed that this is a somewhat precarious note of time. It is not certain that we have here the description of a marriage, nor is it clear whether the "queen" of ver. 10 is identical with the "king's daughter" of ver. 14, for the latter is to be brought to the king, ver. 15, while the former already stands at his right hand. The "king's daughter" need not be a queen, for the royal harem contained such princesses, ver. 10. Still, the impression made on us is that of a royal marriage, and it is not impossible that the personage of ver. 14 may be identical with her of ver. 10. Her nationality, however, is not given ; the reference to Tyre, ver. 13 (supposing the text-reading correct, which is doubtful), shows not that the princess was a Tyrian, but that Tyre was in friendly, possibly tributary, relations with our king, which may have been true at almost any period from David to Zedekiah, and from Alexander Jannæus to Herod (an interruption of friendly relations is indicated in Am. i. 9 ; Joel belongs after the exile). But a marriage, such as that here described or involved, would not necessarily be mentioned in the often meagre narrative of our historical books, and we cannot restrict the possibilities to the cases actually mentioned. Any time, so far as these historical allusions go, when there was a king in Israel, the psalm may have been composed. We have to confine ourselves to kings of Israel ; we have no warrant for supposing that such expressions as these would be employed of a foreign sovereign.

The group xlvi.-xlviii. seems to have in mind some splendid national deliverance : in xlvi. there is reference to mighty movements of nations brought to naught, comp. ii. ; in xlvii. to Israel's subduing the peoples, who are called on to clap their hands and shout to Elohim with the voice of joy ; in xlviii. more definitely to kings who assembled themselves (apparently against Zion), saw, were amazed and dismayed. It is not easy to attach these conditions to any known event of the history. Sennacherib's overthrow, 2 Kgs. xix., has naturally been thought of, but does not very well agree with the burned chariots, xlvi. 10, the subduing of peoples, xlvii. 4, or the hostile confederation of kings, xlviii. 5. There are verbal resemblances between our group and Isa. xxxiii., which seems to have been written during an Assyrian invasion. Comp. ver. 14 of that chapter with our xlviii. 7, ver. 20

with *xlvi.* 13, 14, and *ver.* 21 with *xlvi.* 5 ; but these resemblances are not very striking, and do not decide whether we have here only one author, or two authors independent of each other, or one copying from or imitating the other ; nor does the general situation in Isaiah closely resemble that in the psalms, though this might be explained in part from the difference between prophetic and lyric thought. Others refer these psalms to the destruction of the Moabite-Ammonite host under Jehoshaphat, narrated in 2 Chr. xx. (not mentioned in the book of Kings). But, apart from the doubtful trustworthiness of the Chronicler when he is unsupported by Kings, there is the objection to such a reference that the event in Chronicles took place at a distance from Jerusalem, and would not agree with *xlvi.* ; it might agree with *xlvi.* and *xlvi.*, though here there are other objections to be mentioned presently. It may be that no special contemporary event is referred to in these songs, that we have only a poetical, idealizing outburst of rejoicing and gratitude over the peaceful and religiously exalted position of Israel. This view is supported rather than opposed, by a comparison with *xcvi.*–*xcix.*, to which, as critics have pointed out, our group bears a marked resemblance. The tone of this other group is post-exilian, and would so far supply a note of time for ours ; but to establish this point would require an examination of *xcvi.*–*xcix.*, and I will not pause for that. It may be observed that the “ships of Tarshish,” *xlvi.* 8, does not help us. Apart from the somewhat indefinite signification of this term, the psalmist’s expression seems to be a general one, not relating to a particular occurrence. If, however, it should be supposed to refer definitely to the destruction of a hostile fleet, we should have to regard it as probable that the scene was Eziongeber, and the time somewhere between Jehoshaphat, 1 Kings xxii., and the Maccabees ; if it was an Israelitish fleet, the reference might be to that of Jehoshaphat.

The only specific mention of other nations is in *lxxxvii.*, where we have Rahab (Egypt), Babylon, Philistia, Tyre and Cush (Ethiopia). This particular group of peoples was hardly possible for an Israelitish writer before the latter part of Hezekiah’s reign (see Mic. iv. 10, 2 Kgs. xx.). It is found in Jeremiah and Ezekiel, and would be possible for some time later. Certainly the omission of Persia in this connection might lead us to exclude the post-exilian period, but for the fact that we find Assyria named along with Egypt in Zech. x. 10 in the Grecian period (Zech. ix. 13), whence we may surmise that Assyria and Babylon remained as designations of the Tigris-Euphrates valley and its dependencies after the Semitic empires that once existed

there had vanished ; and we should be by no means shut up to B.C. 608-599, when Judah passed from Egyptian to Babylonian control. But in the introduction of these nations here there is another element of at least equal importance with the enumeration of names and the political relations—it is the religious attitude of the writer towards other peoples. He joyfully welcomes them to citizenship in Israel. Now, in the Second Isaiah, c. B.C. 540, the submission of the nations to Israel is looked to as one feature in the glorious consummation, but their relation is one of subordination, and their function is mainly to minister to the glory of the chosen people ; see Isa. lx. In the psalm there is a more cordially friendly tone, and also, more of the social, every-day tone in comparison with the heroic, idealizing coloring of the prophecy. The psalm thus seems to indicate more familiar acquaintance with foreign nations, and to belong to a later period than the prophecy.

The expression, “turned the captivity of Jacob,” in lxxxv. is generally taken as determining a post-exilian date for the psalm, as indeed it could not, from the connection, be well taken otherwise. The sin of Israel has been forgiven and the people have returned to their land. But new calamities, ethical and physical, have befallen them : they are lacking in faithfulness and justice, and the earth does not give its increase ; the psalmist’s hope is that Yahwe will bestow these blessings. It is a state of things that corresponds with a good deal of exactness to the picture given in Haggai and Zechariah ; but it is so general a description that we cannot say it may not equally correspond to a dozen later periods, only it is true that the remembrance of the exile is fresh in the writer’s mind, and we must not go too far from that point.

In xlv. there are two notes that enable us to fix the date with some precision : on the one hand, the nation is crushed by its enemies, its armies defeated in the field, itself a by-word and derision, and cast off by God ; on the other hand, there is a national consciousness of faithful allegiance to God’s covenant. The second of these conditions did not exist before the exile—from the earliest times to the destruction of the city by the Chaldeans there may be said to be an unbroken record of idolatry : of the period of the early kings there can be no question, and of the prophets, from Amos to Jeremiah, there is not one (except Nahum, who speaks only of Assyria) who does not give such a picture of contemporary national defection as makes it inconceivable that a devout poet of those times should say of his people what our psalmist says ; the only period not covered by

these prophetic utterances is B.C. 700-630, under Manasseh, Amon, and Josiah, on which see 2 Kgs. xxii. If then the confidence with which the singer asserts in the presence of God the nation's fidelity to the divine covenant points to the post-exilian time, the second note, overwhelming defeat of armies, as certainly points to the Maccabean period, the only time after the exile, as far as the preserved history informs us, when the Jews undertook independent military enterprises. For a picture of national defeat and desolation answering to that of our psalm, see 1 Macc. ix. 23-27, or xiii. 1-6.

Emendations and Corrections.¹

BY REV. J. I. MOMBERT, D.D.

IT has been already intimated² that the Hieronymian Version displaced the old very slowly, and that its official adoption by the various churches was rather the result of ecclesiastical usage than of formal authorization.³ Various causes were at work to vitiate it. Jerome did not write out his own version, but dictated it to amanuenses, and employed transcribers to multiply copies for others; these bad copies, not having had the benefit of his own revision, of course contained inaccuracies; subsequent copies grew worse and worse, when transcribers began to interpolate the Hieronymian text by the Itala, and hardly a century after his death, *quot codices tot exemplaria* applied as well to the former as in Jerome's time it had been true of the latter. It is therefore not surprising that the Latin Bible, which passed as Jerome's, very speedily needed revision, and the first to engage in that work was Cassiodorus, one of the most imposing characters of the sixth century, who, in his old age, founded a monastery, and established in it a splendid library which contained, besides the Septuagint and the revised Itala, also the translation of Jerome; his work, *De Institutione Divinarum Literarum*, an introduction to the profitable reading of the Holy Scriptures for the use of the monks, happily preserved,⁴ contains full particulars concerning the causes of the corruptions of the text of the Latin Bible, and the principles to be observed for the preservation of a pure text. With the assistance of some friends he undertook the revision of the Psalter, the Prophets, and the Epistles of the New Testament by old Mss. of Jerome's version, leaving it to his monks as a pattern according to which old copies were to be corrected, and new ones to be made. His principle was to avoid conjecture and a new version, and to restore the original text by collation with the best Mss.; only in cases where the collation failed to fix the original renderings of the Itala the monks were

¹ Read in June, 1885.

² In a former treatise, still in manuscript.

³ See my *Hieronymian Versions*, still in manuscript, and Hody, *De bibliorum textibus originalibus*, &c., pp. 441 sqq.

⁴ Migne, vol. LXX. pp. 1105 sqq.

instructed to consult the LXX., and in the case of similar renderings of the Hieronymian version to have recourse, if possible, to the Hebrew. Cassiodorus cautions the monks against the mischievous practice of modernizing the text, and insists upon its being fixed by documentary evidence; e.g. such renderings as the following he wants to remain unchanged:—

- Ps. VII. 9: *Secundum innocentiam manuum mearum.*
 “ XXVIII. 13: *auribus percipe lacrymas meas.*
 “ LXII. 9: *effundite coram illo corda vestra.*
 “ LXIII. 9: *Adhaesit anima mea post te.*
 “ LXVI. 6: *multiplicasti locupletare eam. Ibi laetabimur in idipsum.*
 “ LXXV. 9: *et inclinavit ex hoc in hoc.*
 “ CV. 26: *Misit Moysen servum suum, Aaron, quem eligit ipsum.*
 “ CXIX. 82: *Defecerunt oculi mei in eloquium tuum.*

Proper names, such as, Seth, Enoch, Lamech, Noe, Sem, Cham, Japhet, Aaron, David; Sion, Oreb, Geon, Hermon, are not to be declined. Ambiguous words, such as, *mons*, *leo*, *cedrus*, *catulus leonis*, *clamor*, *homo*, *fructus*, *calix*, *vitulus*, *pastor*, *thesaurus*, *vermis*, *canis*, etc., are not to be altered, nor are figurative expressions to be exchanged into literal ones; as, *Satanas* into “who swerves from the right way”; *semel* into *incommutabilis*, etc., the interpretation of such words being the province of a commentator, not that of a transcriber; even solecisms, provided they are proved on documentary evidence to be the original readings, must not be touched, such as,—

Ps. 44: 16, *obliti non sumus te*; 55: 24, *vir sanguinum et dolosi*; 24: 1, *terra in qua habitant in ea*; 22: 21, *de manu canis anima mea*; 95: 12, *tunc exsultabunt omnia ligna silvarum*; 98: 8, *flumina plaudent manibus in se*, etc.

On the other hand, Cassiodorus provided his monks with a set of rules for the correction of errors, such as, the wrong case after a preposition, mistakes of declension and conjugation, and even those of orthography, provided that all changes introduced rest on the authority of the ancient Mss.; as to punctuation, they were to see that it be agreeably to the received rules in the *Itala*, but in the new version the colons and commas of Jerome were to be decisive. These judicious and scholarly directions, however, appear alas! to have remained a dead letter, for, in the seventh century, the Hieronymian text had become notoriously corrupt, and in the eighth so confused and utterly uncertain that a revision of it was indispensable. The impetus, curiously enough, was not given by the church, but by

Charlemagne, who, about 800, charged Alcuin, his chancellor and friend, to provide a reliable text of the Latin Bible. There is no evidence that Alcuin, who presented his revision to Charlemagne on Christmas day, 801,¹ consulted the Greek and Hebrew originals; the passages which Hody (*l. c.*, p. 409) adduces to show his knowledge of Hebrew are simply quotations from Jerome, and in one instance, Gen. xxv. 8, where the latter calls attention to its inadequate rendering,² Alcuin left the passage as it stood. His revision is just such a one as Cassiodorus had recommended, and seems to have consisted in the collation of Mss. of the Vulgate. Its success, doubtless promoted by the vast influence of Charlemagne, — whose main object was to establish a uniform text, especially in the church service, — was very marked, and the *Biblia Alcuini* or *Biblia Caroli Magni*, rapidly drove out of use all other editions of the Bible. Carefully prepared copies were distributed throughout the empire, and a relatively large number of such Mss. has been preserved. The Alcuinian revision was, on the whole, very creditable, and the text he furnished a vast improvement on its predecessors. An example will illustrate this: —

*Specimen Characterum Bibliorum Sacrorum Venerabilis Monasterii
S. Pauli extra muros Urbis Romae scriptorum tempore Karoli
Magni, Blanchini, Ev. Quad. II. p. dlxxvii.*

SCD

Lucae Cap. III Anno autem quinto decimo Imperii Tiberii caesaris procurante pontio pilato iudaeam Tetrarcha autē galileae herode philippo autem fratre eius tetrarcha itureae & traconitidis regionis & lysania abyline tetrarcha sub principibus sacerdotum anna & caipha Factum est uerbum dñi super iohannem zachariae filiū in deserto

Et uenit in omnem regionem iordanis praedicans baptismum paenitentiae in remissionem peccatorū sicut scriptum est in libro sermonum isaiæ prophetae Vox clamantis in deserto parate uiam dñi rectas facite semitas eius Omnis uallis implebitur & omnis mons & collis humiliabitur & erunt praua in directa & aspera in uias planas Et uidebit omnis caro salutare dñi

Dicebat ergo ad turbas quae exiebant ut baptizarentur ab ipso Genimina uiperarū quis ostendit uobis fugere a uentura ira? Facite ergo fructus dignos paenitentiae & ne coeperitis dicere patrem habemus abraham. Dico enī uobis quia potest dñs de lapidibus istis suscitare filios abraham. Iam enim securis ad radicē arborum posita est Omnis ergo arbor non faciens fructum bonum excidetur & in ignem mittetur

¹ See Kaulen, *Geschichte der Vulgata*, for excerpts from the epistles of Alcuin.

² Hieron. *Quaest. Hebr. in Gen.*, Op. III., p. 344, ed. Vall.

Et interrogabant eū turbæ dicentes: Quid ergo faciemus? Respondens autē dicebat illis: Qui habet duas tunicas det non habenti: Et qui habet escas similiter faciat: Venerunt autem & publicani ut baptizarentur & dixerunt ad illum

Magister quid faciemus? At ille dixit ad eos: Nihil amplius quam quod constitutum est vobis faciat: Interrogabant autē eū & milites dicentes: Quid faciemus & nos? Et ait illis: Neminem concutiat: neque calumniam faciat: & contempti estote stipendiis uestris: Existimante autē populo & cogitantibus omnibus in cordibus suis de iohanne ne forte ipse esset xps? Respondit iohannes dicens omnibus: Ego quidem aqua baptizo vos: Ueniet autem fortior me cuius non sum dignus soluere corrigiam calciamentoru eius ipse vos baptizabit in spū sto & igni

Cuius uentilabrium in manu eius & purgabit aream suam & congregabit triticū in horreum suum: paleas autē comburet igni inextinguibili: Multa quidem & alia exhortans euangelizabat populo:

The general arrangement of *capitula* and *versus*, etc., in the Alcuin Ms., called *Charlemagne's Bible* (Brit. Mus. Addit. 10, 516), taken from Smith, *Dict. of the Bible*, III., p. 1704, brings out all the salient features of that class of Latin Bibles:—

Epistola ad Paulinum. Praefatio.

<i>Bresit</i> , i.e. <i>Genesis</i>	capp.	LXXXII. habet versos	III.DCC.
<i>Ellesmoth</i> , i.e. <i>Exodus</i>	capp.	CXXXVIII.	V. III.
<i>Leuiticus</i> , Hebraice <i>Vaieera</i>	capp.	LXXXVIII.	V. II.CCC.
<i>Numeri</i>	capp.	LXXVIII. hab. vers. numr.	III.
<i>Addabarim</i> , Grece <i>Deuteronomium</i>	capp.	CLV. habet vers.	II.DC.
Praefatio Jesu Naue et Iudicum.			
<i>Josue Ben Nun.</i>	capp.	XXXIII. habet vers.	I.DCCL.
<i>Softim</i> , i.e. <i>Judicum</i> (liber)	capp.	XVIII. habet vers. numr.	I.DCCL.
<i>Ruth</i>	none.		habet vers. numr. CCL.
Praefatio (Prologus galeatus).			
<i>Samuhel</i> (Regum) lib. prim.	capp.	XXVI. habet vers.	II.CCC.
<i>Samuhel</i> (Regum) lib. sec.	capp.	XVIII. habet versus,	II.CC.
<i>Malachim</i> , i.e. <i>Regum</i> lib. tert.	capp.	XVIII. (for XVIII.) habet vers.	II.D.
<i>Malachim</i> , i.e. <i>Regum</i> lib. quart.	capp.	XVII. habet versus	II.CCL.
Prologus.			
<i>Isaias</i>	none.		habet vers. III.DLXXX.
Prologus			
<i>Hieremias</i> (with Lam. and Prayer)	none.		habet versus IIII.CCCCL.
Prologus			
<i>Hiezecheel</i> (-iel)	none.		none.
<i>Danihel</i>	none.		habet versus I.DCCCL.
<i>Osee, Jothel, Amos, Abdias, Jonas,</i>			
<i>Michas, Naum, Abacuc,</i>			
<i>Sophonias, Aggeus, Zacharias,</i>			

<i>Malachias,</i>	none.	none.	
Prologus			
<i>Job</i>	none.		V. I.DCC.
Origo Proph. David.	Praefatio		
Liber <i>Psalmorum</i> (Gallican)	none.	habet vr.	V.
Epist. ad Chroni. et Heliod.			
Liber <i>Proverbiorum.</i>	capp.	LX. habet versus	I.DCCXL.
<i>Ecclesiastes</i>	capp.	XXXI. none.	
<i>Cantica Canticorum</i>	none.	habet vers.	CCLXXX.
Liber <i>Sapientiae</i>	capp.	XLVIII. habet versus	I.DCC.
<i>Ecclesiasticus</i>	capp.	CXXVII. habet versus	II.DCCC.
Praefatio			
<i>Dabreiamin</i> lib. prim.	none.	hab. (sic).	
<i>Paralypomion</i> (lib. sec.)	none.	none.	
Praefatio			
Liber <i>Esrae</i>	—	—	
Prologus			
<i>Hester</i> (with addit.)	none.	habet versus	V.DCC.
Praefatio			
<i>Tobias</i>	none.	none.	
Prologus			
<i>Judith</i>	—	habet versus	I.C.
Liber <i>Machabr.</i> prim.	LXI.	none.	
<i>Machabr.</i> liber sec.	LV.	—	
Praef. ad Damasum.			
Argumentum.			
Canones.			
Prologus.			
<i>Mattheus</i>	capp.	LXXXI. habet vers.	II.DCC.
<i>Marcus</i>	capp.	XLVI. hab.	V. I.DCC.
<i>Lucas</i>	capp.	LXXIII. vers.	III.DCCC.
<i>Johannes</i>	capp.	XXXV. vers.	I. DCCC.
Lib. <i>Actuum Apost.</i>	capp.	LXXIII. habet vers.	III.DC.
Prologus septem Epistolarium Can.			
Epistl. <i>Sci. Jacobi</i>	capp.	XX. none.	
Epistl. <i>Sci. Petri prim.</i>	capp.	XX. —	
Epistl. <i>Sci. Petri sec.</i>	capp.	XI. —	
Epistl. <i>Sci. Joh. prim.</i>	capp.	XX. —	
Epistl. <i>Sci. Joh. sec.</i>	capp.	V. —	
Epistl. <i>Sci. Joh. tert.</i>	capp.	V. —	
Epistl. <i>Sci. Jud.</i>	capp.	VII. —	
Epla. ad Romanos	capp.	II. habet versus	DCCCCXI.
Epla. ad Cor. prim.	capp.	LXXII. none.	
Epla. ad Cor. sec.	capp.	XXVIII. hab. vers.	CCXCII.
Epla. ad Galathas	capp.	XXXVII. habet versus	CCXIII.
Epla. ad Ephesios	capp.	XXXI. habet versus	CCCXVII.
Epla. ad Philippenses	capp.	XVIII. none.	
Epla. ad Thess. prim.	capp.	XXV. habet versus	CCXIII.

Epla. <i>ad Thess. sec.</i>	capp.	VIII. none.	
Epla. <i>ad Colosenses</i>	capp.	XXXI. none.	
Epla. <i>ad Tim. prim.</i>	capp.	XXX. vers.	CCXXX.
Epla. <i>ad Tim. sec.</i>	capp.	XXV. none.	
Epla. <i>ad Tit.</i>	capp.	X. none.	
Epla. <i>ad Philem.</i>	capp.	III. none.	
Epla. <i>ad Hebr.</i>	capp.	XXXVIII. none.	
Epla. <i>ad Laodicenses.</i>	none.	none.	
<i>Apocalypsis.</i>	capp.	XXV. habet versus	̄DCCC.

Each book of the N. T., except the Cath. Epp. and the Ep. to the Laodiceans, is preceded by an *argumentum*, and the whole Ms. closes with sixty-eight Latin hexameter verses.

Such poetical additions are very common in Alcuinian Mss.; one at Amsterdam has the following:—

Quatuor hi rutilant uno de fonte fluentes
Matthaei et Marci· Lucae liber atque Johannis·
Sanctus Apostolus Lucas conscripserat Actus·
Bis septem doci per cartas dogmata Pauli·
Jacobi· Petri· Judæ et pia dicta Johannis·
Scribitur extremo Johannes in ordine tomus·
Jusserat hos omnes Christi deductus amore
Alcuinus Ecclesiæ famulus conscribere libros.¹

The following six lists, exhibiting the *ordo librorum* in different Mss. at different periods, may be convenient for reference:—

I. Codex *Toletanus*: Genes. Exod. Lev. Num. Deuteron. Josue. Judicum. Ruth. Regum IV. Isaias. Jeremias. Ezechiel. Osee. Joel. Amos. Abdias. Jonas. Michas. Nahum. Habacuc. Sophonias. Aggeus. Zacharias. Malachias. Job. Psalmorum. Proverbia. Ecclesiastes. Cant. Cantic. Daniel. Paralipom. II. Esdras II. Esther. Hic explicit canon hebraicae veritatis. Sapientiae. Ecclesiasticus. Tobias. Judith. Machab. II. Evang. sec. Mattheum. Evang. sec. Marcum. Evang. sec. Lucam. Evang. sec. Johannem. Actus apostol. Pauli epistolae ad Rom. ad Corinth. II. ad Galat. ad Ephes. ad Philipp. ad Coloss. ad Laodic. ad Thessal. II. ad Timotheum II. ad Titum. ad Philemon. Ep. Jacobi. Ep. Petri II. Ep. Johannis III. Ep. Judae. Apocalypsis. — Blanchini, *Vindiciae*.

II. Codex *Amiatinus*: Genesis. Exod. Lev. Num. Deut. Josue. Judicum. Ruth. Samuhel [i.e. 1, 2 Reg.]. Malachim [i.e. 3, 4 Reg.]. Paralypomenon [i.e. libri 2]. Lib. Psalmorum. Proverbia. Ecclesiastes. Cant. Cantic. Sapientiae. Ecclesiasticus. Esaias. Hieremias. Hiezechiel. Danihel. Osee. Johel. Amos. Abdias. Jonas. Michas. Naum. Habacuc. Soffonias. Aggeus. Zacharias. Malachias. Job. Thobias. Judith. Hester. Esdras [i.e. libri 2]. Machab. lib. II. Evang. sec.

¹ For an account of Alcuinian Mss., see Blanchini *Vindic.* passim; Vercellone, *Varr. Lect.* I. p. lxxxiv. sqq.; Kaulen, *l. c.* p. 236 sq.; Smith, *Dict. of the Bible*, III. p. 1704.

Mattheum. Evang. sec. Marcum. Evang. sec. Lucam. Evang. sec. Johannem. Actus Apostolorum. *Epist. Pauli apost.*: ad Romanos I. ad Corintheos II. ad Galatas I. ad Ephesios I. ad Philipp. I. ad Colosens. I. ad Thessalonic. II. ad Timotheum II. ad Titum I. ad Philimon I. ad Hebreos I. Epist. Jacobi I. Epist. Petri II. Epist. Johannis III. Epist. Judae I. Apocalypsis Johan. Amen. Bandini, *Dissert.* etc. Vercellone, *Varr. Lect.* I. p. lxxxiii. Tischend. *Cod. Amiat.* prolegg.

Order of the Books according to Cassiodorus, De instit. divinarum litterarum, Capp. xii-xiv.

III. Cap. xiv. *Septuagint.* V. T.: Genesis. Exodus. Leviticus. Numeri. Deuteronomium. Jesu Nave. Judicum. Ruth. Regum libri IV. Paralipomenon libri II. Psalmorum *Salomonis libri V.*: Proverbiorum. Sapientiae. Ecclesiasticus. Ecclesiastes. Cant. Cantic. *Prophetas*: Isaia. Jeremia. Ezechiel. Daniel. Osee. Amos. Michas. Joel. Abdias. Jonas. Naum. Habacuc. Sophonias. Aggeus. Zacharias. Malachias. Job. Tobias. Esther. Judith. Esdrae libri II. Machab. libri. II. N. T.: Mattheus. Marcus. Lucas. Johannes. Actus Ap. Epist. Petri ad gentes II. Epist. Judae. Epist. Jacobi ad XII. tribus. Epist. Joannis ad Parthos. *Epist. Pauli* ad Romanos. ad Corinthios II. ad Galatas. ad Philippenses. ad Colossenses. ad Hebraeos. ad Thessaloniens. II. ad Timotheum II. ad Titum. ad Philemon. Apocalypsis.

IV. Cap. xii. *Jerome.* V. T. *Lex*: Gen. Ex. Levit. Num. Deut. *Prophetas*: Jesu Nave. Judicum. Ruth. Samuel. Isaias. Jeremias. Ezechiel. Daniel. Libri XII. prophetarum. *Hagiographa*: Job. David. *Salomon*: Proverbia. Ecclesiasticus. Cantic. Cantic. Verba dierum: i.e. Paralipomenon. Esdras. Esther. N. T. *Evangelist.*: Mattheus. Marcus. Lucas. Joannes. *Epistolae Apostolorum*: Petri II. Pauli XIV. Joannis III. Jacobi I. Judae I. Actuum apostolorum Lucae liber I. Apocalypsis Joannis lib. I.

V. Cap. xiii. *Augustine.* V. T. *Historia, libri XXII*: Moysi libri V. Jesu Nave lib. I. Judicum lib. I. Ruth lib. I. Regum lib. IV. Paralipom. lib. II. Job. lib. I. Tobiae lib. I. Esther lib. I. Judith lib. I. Esdrae lib. II. Machab. lib. II. *Prophetas, libri XXII*: David. Psalm. lib. I. Solomon. lib. IV. Jesu fil. Sir. lib. I. *Proph. majores* lib. IV. Isaias. Jeremias. Ezechiel. Daniel. *Proph. minores* lib. XII. Osee. Joel. Amos. Abdias. Jonas. Michas. Nahum. Habacuc. Sophonias. Zacharias. Aggeus. Malachias. N. T. *Epistolae Apostol.* XXI: *Epistolae Pauli* ad Rom. lib. I. ad Corinth. lib. II. ad Galat. lib. I. ad Ephes. lib. I. ad Philipp. lib. I. ad Thessal. lib. II. ad Coloss. lib. I. ad Tim. lib. II. ad Tit. lib. I. ad Philem. lib. I. ad Hebr. lib. I. *Epist. Petri* lib. II. *Epist. Joannis.* lib. III. *Epist. Judae* lib. I. *Epist. Jacobi* lib. I. *Evangelia IV*: Evang. sec. Matth. lib. I. Evang. sec. Marc. lib. I. Evang. sec. Lucam lib. I. Evang. sec. Joannem lib. I. Actus Apostolorum lib. I. Apocalypsis lib. I.

A Latin Ms., beautifully written, assigned to the 14th century, in the Astor Library, New York, is a good Vulgate with the Gallican version of the Psalter and the *capitulatio* very nearly agreeing with that of modern editions of the Bible. The *ordo*, however, differs

materially. The metrical *ordo*, partly in old French and Latin, is curious, and points, like the Gallican Psalter, to French origin.

Feroime qui riens noublia.
 Ordinavit in bibliā.
 Libros sacros in huc modū.
 Genesin et post exodu.
 Leviticus est tertius.
 Numeri. deuteronomius.
 Apres Josue. Judicum.
 Ruth. quatuor libri regu.
 De paralipomenū *deulx*.
 Le premier d'esdras apres eulx.
 Le second est apres heremie (sic)
 Judith hester sont soutz tobie.
 Job. david salmon. ysaie.
 Et le prophete Jeremye,
 Ezechiel laygle volant,
 Et daniel le sage enfant.
 Duodena prophetia,
 Machabea milicia.
 Du nouueau qūtre euangelistes.
 Et de saint paul xiiii epistres,
 Actus Jacques la canonique,
 Pierre ii Jehan iii Jude unique.
 Puy saint Jehan en apocalipse,
 Fait du tout la fin bien propice.

Then follows :—

Ordo et numerus librorū et capitulor. biblie.

Genesis, cap. LI. Exodi XL. Levitici XXVII. Numeri XXXVI. Deuteronomii XXXIII. Josue XXIII. Judicum XXI. Ruth III. Primus regum XXXI. Secundus regum XXIII. Tertius regum XXII. Quartus regum XX. Primus paralipomenū XXVIII. Secundus paralipomenū XXXVIII. Primus esdre XI. Neemie XIII. Secundus esdre IX. Thobie XIII. Judith XVI. Hester XVI. Job XLII. Psalmorum CL. Prouerbiorum XXXI. Ecclesiastes XII. Canticorum VIII. Sapiencie XIX. Ecclesiastici LI. *Libri prophetarū*: Ysaie LXVI. Jeremie LIII. Treni seu trenoru. III. Baruch VI. Ezechielis XLVIII. Danielis XII. Osee XIII. Joelis III. Amos IX. Abdie I. Jone III. Michee VIII. Naum III. Abacuch III. Sophonie III. Agei II. Zacharie XIII. Malachie III. Primus Machabeor. XV. Secundus Machabeor. XV. *Libri euangelistarū*: Mathei XXVIII. Marci XVIII. Luce XXIII. Johannis XXI. *Epistole pauli et alior.* Ad romanos XVI. Prima ad corinthios XVI. Secūda ad corinthios (sic) XIII. Ad galathas VI. Ad ephesios VI. Ad Philipenses III. Ad colocenses III. Prima ad thessalonicen. V. Secūda ad thessalonicen. III. Prima ad tymotheū VI. Secūda ad tymotheū III. Ad titum III. Ad philemonem I. Ad hebreos XIII. Actus apostolorū XXVIII. Epistola iacobi V. Prima petri V. Secūda

petri III. Prima Johannis V. Secunda Johannis I. Tertia Johannis I. Epistola iude I. Apocalipsis XXII.

Contents :

No title. 1. Metrical ordo. 2. Ordo et numerus. 3. Prol. ep. S. Jeromini etc. ad paulinum. 4. Prologus in Pentat. 5. Genesis — 2 Machabeorum, in the given order with the usual Prologues to Jos. 1 Reg. 1 Paralip. 1 Esdr. Tob. Judith. Hester. Job. Salom. (Prov.) Eccles. Sap. Is. Jer. Baruch (præfatio). Ezech. Dan. Osee (two, viz. *Non idem ordo est*, etc., and *Temporibus ozie*, etc.), Joel. Amos. Abdias. Jonas. Michæas. Naum. Aggeus. Zach. Mal. 1 Machab.

Then follows, without a break in the body of the page, —

6. The New Testament, with prologues to Math. Marc. Luc. Joh. Rom. 1 Corinth. 2 Corinth. Gal. Eph. Philip. Colos. 1 Thess. 2 Thess. 1 Tim. 2 Tim. Tit. Philem. Hebr. Act. — Epistol. Canonicas (general); 7. Interpretationes. and 8. Supplemental Prologues to 2 Paralip. Ecclus. Joel. Amos (two additional). Abdias. Jonas. Mich. Naum (two additional). Abacuc (two). Sophon. (two). Aggias (two additional). Zachar. Matth. and Apocalyps.

The whole codex is written in Gothic letter, and, according to No. 1 (*q.v.*), by a French transcriber, who wrote 1 and 2, but neither the remainder of the Ms. from 3 to end of 7, nor 8. The body of the Ms. (Nos. 3–7 incl.) is written by one hand, corrections by another, and interlineary matter in carmine by a third. The omission of *h* in *hortus* and similar words shows that the writer was a Frenchman.

The writing is quite ornate, and the numerous illuminations and miniatures are of great artistic merit. The latter, examined under a magnifying glass are remarkable for drawing, coloring and expression. The Psalms are numbered, and display in scutcheons of various shapes the titles, e.g. Ps. XXI. *in finem. psalmus david. pro susceptione vel assumptione matutina seu pro cerva matutina*. The text of the Psalter is the Gallican, and throughout the remainder of the Ms. a good Vulgate. A picture of the text may be had from the collation in PRINTED TEXT, p. 2, here supplied : —

Ms. at Bonn, 13th century, de- Ms. in Astor Library, New York,
scribed by Kaulen, *Vulgata*, 14th century :
pp. 276, 7 :

Baruch.

I. 7 ioachim. helchiar. salomi.	ioachim. helchie. salon.
8 siban. Zedechias. yosie.	siban. sedechias. iosie.
9 et vinctos et potentes. duxit eos in babil.	et vinctos potentes. duxit eos in babil.
10 holocaustomata.	holocaustomata.
11 regis babiloniae. dies ipsorum	regis babilonie. dies ipsorum

- | | |
|--|--|
| 12 ut det | et det |
| 14 in oportuno die | in die oportuno |
| 15 et Jerus. habitantibus | et habitatoribus Ierusal. |
| 16 nostris. sacerd. nostris | nostris. sacerd. nostris |
| 18 et non obaudivimus | et non audivimus |
| 19 ad hunc diem | in hunc diem |
| 20 mala multa | multa mala |
| II. 4 et dedit nos. in circ. n.
sunt. et desol. | et dedit illos. sunt in circ. n.
et in desol. |
| 12 inique egimus | impie egimus |
| 14 adduxerunt | adduxerunt |
| 16 exaudi. Aperi | et audi. Aperi |
| 19 quaerimus miseric. | et petimus misericordiam |
| 23 vocem gaudimonii | vocem iocunditatis |
| 25 sunt proiecta | sunt proiecta |
| 29 obaudieritis. ambitio haec m. in
minimum. ego dispergam
illos | audieritis. multitudo hec m. in
minimum. ego disperdam
illos |
| 34 patribus illorum. et ysaac.
ominab. eius | patribus eorum. isaac et iacob.
dominabunt. eius |
| III. 4 quia peccav. | quia peccav. |
| 5 iniquitates | iniquitatis |
| 8 nos hod. in capt. sumus. qui
discesserunt | nos hod. in capt. nostra sumus.
qui discesserunt |
| 13 sapientiae. Si | sapientie nam si |
| 19 alii in loco | et alii in locum illorum |
| 21 a facie eorum | a facie eorum |
| 23 exquisierunt. et negotiatores
terrae | exquisierunt. negotiatores
terre |
| 25 magnus et | magnus et |
| 27 elegit deus. viam disc.
dedit illis | elegit dominus. viam disc.
inven. |
| 28 et quia | et quoniam |
| 29 et deduxit | et deduxit |
| 30 invenit eam | invenit eam |
| 32 et invenit | et adiunxit |
| 33 obaudit | obaudit |
| 34 lumen ded. | dederunt lum. |
| IV. 1 tenent eam ad vitam: eam
ad mortem | tenent eam perv. ad vitam: eam
in mortem |
| 4 quoniam. nobis manif. sunt | quoniam. nobis manif. sunt |
| 8 obliti autem | obliti autem |
| 16 adduxerunt | abduxerunt |
| 24 vestram: sic vid. | vestram: sic vid. |
| 27 ducit | ducit |
| 31 Nocentes parebunt | Nocentes peribunt |
| 32 punientur. quae | punientur. quae |
| 33 in tuo casu | in tuo casu |

- 35 in multitudinem
 V. 1 decorem et honorem
 2 circumdato te dipl. deo iustitiae: capiti tuo: honoris
 3 in te: qui
 8 autem silvae: israel mandato
 9 ab ipso *Ep. Jerem.*
 VI. 1 adducemini
 2 babiloniam: eritis illic. et tempus longum. adducam
 6 Angelus autem
 8 fabricata
 9 habent aureas. ab illis. semetipsis
 14 gladium in manu
 15 veneremini eos
 17 tutant
 19 dicuntur. vest. eorum
 20 nigrae sunt
 22 scietis
 24 non est in ipsis
 26 non surgent
 27 sacerd. ipsorum vend.
 34 div. dare. nec hoc
 36 restituent
 38 dii eorum. lapidei aurei. colunt illa
 40 illum
 42 circumdatis. succedentes
 43 abstracta dormierit. prox.
 45 et aurificibus
 46 aurifices. possunt. que ab ipsis fabr. sunt
 48 sacerdotes ubi
 50 lignea et inaurata. opus dei in illis est
 52 suscitant: pluviam hom. non dabunt
 54 cum ceciderit. aureorum et argenteorum
 55 aut dicendum
 57 ferunt
 58 illud. quam falsi dii: vel ostium
 59 et sidera
 63 esse illos deos. neque facere
 71 quoque. et marmore. super illud. et erit oppr.
 in multitudinem
 decore et honore
 circumdabit te dip. deus iusticie: capiti tuo: honoris
 in te qui. *om.* omni
 autem silve: israel mandato
 ex ipso
 adducemini
 babiloniam: eritis illuc. in tempus longum. adducam
 angelus autem
 fabricata
 habent aureas. ab eis. semetipsis
 gladium in manu
 ita obturant
 dicunt. vest. eorum
 nigrae facies eorum
 sciatis
 non est in ipsis
 non consurgent
 sacerd. ipsorum vend.
 divit. dare. necque hoc
 restituent
 dii eorum. lapidei et aurei. colunt illos.
 illum
 circumdantes. succedentes
 attracta. dormierit proxime
 ab aurificibus
 aurifices. possunt. q ab ipsis fabr. sunt.
 sacerdotes ubi
 lignea et inaurata. nullum opus dei ē in illis
 suscitant. neque pluv. hom. dabunt
 cum ceciderit. aureorum et argenteorum
 aut recipiendum
uncertain: fert
 illud: vel ostium — quam falsi dii
 et sidera
 illos deos esse
 purpura quoque et a marmore. super illud. et erit in oppr.

The abstract of *Cantica Cantic.*, with an allegorical interpretation written in carmine over the respective words in italics, is interesting.

The Ms. is not paginated, but has signatures of unequal length, the last being numbered XXXVIII. ; at the end of each signature a catchword is in the extreme right-hand corner of the lower margin, which has been reduced by cutting. I have discovered that one leaf is missing ; it contains *Sap.* XIV. 15 (con)stituit — spiritu sancto, *Ecclus.* I. 9. It may be bound up in the volume in the wrong place, but it certainly is not in the right place.

Cantica Cantic. : —

Cap. I.	3. <i>Trahe me</i> —	vox ecclesiae ad christum.
	<i>Introduxit me</i> —	" sponsæ ad adolescentulos.
	4. <i>Nigra sum</i> —	" synagogæ.
	6. <i>indica mihi</i> —	" ecclesiæ ad christum.
	7. <i>Si ignoras te</i> —	" christi ad ecclesiam.
	10. <i>Murenulas aur.</i> —	" amicorum.
	11. <i>Dum esset</i> —	" ecclesiæ.
	14. <i>Ecce tu pulc.</i> —	" christi.
	15. <i>Ecce tu pulc.</i> —	" ecclesiæ.
Cap. II.	1. <i>Ego flos</i> —	" christi.
	3. <i>Sicut malus</i> —	" ecclesiæ.
	7. <i>Adjuro vos</i> —	" christi.
	8. <i>Vox dilecti</i> —	" ecclesiæ.
	10. <i>surge</i> —	" christi.
	15. <i>Capite nobis vulp.</i> —	" adversus haereses.
	16. <i>Dilect. meus</i> —	" ecclesiæ.
Cap. III.	1. <i>In lectulo</i> —	" eccl. electæ de gentibus.
	3. <i>num quem</i> —	ecclesia de christo dicit.
	5. <i>Adjuro</i> —	vox christi.
	6. <i>Quae est ista</i> —	synagoga de ecclesia.
	7. <i>En lectulum</i> —	vox ecclesiæ.
	11. <i>Egredimini</i> —	" ecclesiæ de chr. dicit.
Cap. IV.	1. <i>Quam pulc.</i> —	vox christi ad ecclesiam.
	6. <i>vadam ad</i> —	sponsus de sponsa dicit.
	7. <i>Tota pulc.</i> —	sponsus ad sponsam.
	16. <i>Surge aq.</i> —	christus gentes convocat.
Cap. V.	1. <i>Veniat dil.</i> —	ecclesia de christo dicit.
	<i>Comedite am.</i> —	christus ad apostol. dicit.
	3. <i>Exspoliaui me tunica</i> —	sponsa ad semetipsam.
	4. <i>Dilectus meus</i> —	vox ecclesiæ de christo.
	9. <i>Qualis est dil.</i> —	" synagogæ.
	10. <i>Dil. meus cand.</i> —	" ecclesiæ de christo. .
	17. <i>Quo abiit</i> —	" synagogæ ad ecclesiam.
Cap. VI.	1. <i>Dilectus meus</i> —	" ecclesiæ.
	3. <i>Pulcra es</i> —	" christi ad ecclesiam.
	10. <i>Descendi ad ortum</i> —	" ecclesiæ ad synagogam.

	11. <i>Nescivi</i> —	" <i>synagogæ.</i>
	12. <i>Revertere</i> —	" <i>consolatoris ecclesiæ.</i>
Cap. VII.	1. <i>Quid videbis</i> —	" <i>synagogæ.</i>
	<i>Quam pulcri</i> —	" <i>christi ad ecclesiam.</i>
	8. <i>Dixi: ascendam</i> —	<i>sponsus de sancta cruce dicit.</i>
	<i>et erunt</i> —	<i>sponsus de sponsa.</i>
	9. <i>dignum dil. meo</i> —	<i>ecclesia de christo dicit.</i>
	10. <i>Ego dilecto meo</i> —	<i>sponsa de sponso.</i>
	11. <i>Veni dilecte mi</i> —	<i>ecclesia ad christum.</i>
Cap. VIII.	1. <i>Quis mihi det</i> —	<i>vox patriarch. de christo.</i>
	4. <i>Adjuro vos</i> —	" <i>christi.</i>
	5. <i>Quæ est ista</i> —	" <i>synagogæ de ecclesia.</i>
	<i>Sub arbore malo</i> —	" <i>sponsi de sponsa.</i>
	6. <i>Pone me ut</i> —	<i>ecclesia ad christum dicit.</i>
	8. <i>Soror nostra parva</i> —	<i>christus ad synagogam.</i>
	9. <i>Si murus est</i> —	<i>christus sibi respondet.</i>
	10. <i>Ego murus</i> —	<i>respondit ecclesia.</i>
	11. <i>Vinea fuit</i> —	<i>synagoga de christo dicit.</i>
	12. <i>Vinea mea</i> —	<i>christus dicit.</i>
	13. <i>Quæ habitas in ortis</i> —	<i>christus ad ecclesiam dicit.</i>
	14. <i>Fuge dilecte mi</i> —	<i>vox ecclesiæ ad christum.</i>

*Literal transcript:*¹

I.	3. Trahe me	<i>vox ecclesiæ ad xtm.</i>
	Introduxit me	" <i>sponsæ ad adolescentulos.</i>
	4. nigra sum	" <i>synagogæ.</i>
	6. indica mihi	" <i>ecclæ ad xtm.</i>
	7. Si ignoras te	" <i>xti ad ecclm.</i>
	10. Murenulas aur.	" <i>amicorum.</i>
	11. Dum esset	" <i>ecclæ.</i>
	14. Ecce tu pulc.	" <i>xti.</i>
	15. Ecce tu pulc.	" <i>ecclæ.</i>
II.	1. Ego flos	" <i>xti.</i>
	3. Sicut malus	" <i>ecclæ</i>
	7. Adiuro vos	" <i>xti.</i>
	8. Vox dilecti	" <i>ecclæ.</i>
	10. surge	" <i>xti.</i>
	15. Capite nobis vulp.	" <i>adversus hereses.</i>
	16. Dilectus meus	" <i>ecclæ.</i>
III.	1. In lectulo	" <i>eccl. electæ de gentibus</i>
	3. num quem	" <i>ecclesia de xto dixit.</i>
	5. Adiuro	" <i>xti.</i>
	6. Quæ est ista	" <i>synagoga de ecclæ</i>
	7. En lectulum	" <i>ecclæ.</i>
	11. Egredimini	" <i>ecclæ de xto dicit.</i>

¹ I had prepared two copies of this interpretation, the one spelt out, the other literal, intending to use the former only; both copies were sent to the printer, whose neat and accurate reproduction of the latter induces me to retain both.

IV.	1. Quam pulch.	vox xti ad eccl ^m .
	6. vadam ad m.	sponsus de sponsa dicit.
	7. Tota pulc.	sponsus ad sponsam.
	16. Surge aquilo	xtus gentes convocat.
V.	1. Veniat dilectus	ecclē de xto dicit.
	Comedite amici	xts ad apost ⁹ dicit.
	3. Exspoliaui me tunica	sponsa ad semetipsam.
	4. Dilectus meus	vox ecclē de xto.
	9. Qualis est dilect. t.— o pulcherr.	" synagogæ.
	10. Dileus meus cand.	" ecclæ de xto.
	17. Quo abiit	" syn. ad eccl ^m .
VI.	1. Dilectus meus	" ecclæ.
	3. Pulcra es	" xti ad eccl ^m .
	30. Descendi ad ortum	" eccæ ad syn ^m .
	11. Nescivi	" synagogæ.
	12. Revertere	" consolatoris eccæ.
VII.	1. Quid videbis	" synagogæ.
	11. Quam pulcri	" xti ad eccl ^m .
	8. Dixi: ascendam	Sponsus de sancta cruce dicit.
	11. et erunt	Sponsus de sponsa.
	9. dignum dil. meo	ecclæ de xto dicit.
	10. Ego dil ^o meo	Sponsa de sponso.
	11. Veni dil. mi	eccl ^a ad xtum.
VIII.	1. Quis mihi det	Vox patriarchū de xto.
	4. Adiuro vos filiæ	Vox xti.
	5. Quæ est ista	" synagogæ de ecclæ.
	Sub arbore malo	" sponsi de sponsa.
	6. Pone me ut sign.	eccl. ad xtum dicit.
	8. Soror nostra parva	xto ad synagogam.
	9. Si murus est	xtus sibi respondit.
	10. Ego murus	Respondit ecclæ.
	11. Vineâ fuit	Synagogæ christo docit.
	12. Vineâ mea	xtus dicit.
	13. Quæ habitas in ortis	xtus ad eccl ^m dicit.
	14. Fuge. dilecti mi	vox eccle ad xtum.

The history of the division of the Latin Bible into chapters and verses contains much curious and interesting information. Concerning Jerome, little is known beyond his mentioning *capitula*, which were not made by himself, but existed in the Mss. he used, and must have been conspicuous to the eye; these *capitula*, moreover, were different in the Hebrew, Greek and Latin Ms.¹ The division *he*

¹ Mic. vi. 9: In hebraicis alterius hoc capituli exordium est, apud LXX. vero finis superioris.—Sophon. III. 14: Non videatur mirum, aliter hebraica capitula et aliter LXX. græca videlicet latinaque finiri. Ubi enim in sensu diversa translatio est, ibi necesse est diversa esse vel principia vel fines.

introduced relates only to lines (*versus*) marked off by means of *kola* and *kommata* for the special help of ignorant ministers to bring out the meaning in reading the lessons.¹

The divisions in Latin Mss. are not uniform, but generally agree with the summary of contents given at the head of the several books; the terms *capitula*, *breves* and *tituli* are used to designate such divisions; Martianay (*Bibliotheca*, Prolegg. IV.), e.g. shows that Genesis contains XXXVIII *tituli*, XLVI *breves*, and LXXXII (or CLIV) *capitula*. The abstract of Charlemagne's Bible (p. 95) gives the *capitula*, the tables (p. 97 sq.) the *ordo*, and the account (p. 98 sqq.) *ordo*, *numerus*, and *capp*. Numerous examples are collected in Thomasius, *Opera omnia*. T. I. *continens sacror. biblior. veteres titulos, sectiones, etc.*, ed. Vezzosi, Romæ 1747. Our modern division into chapters is ascribed to Stephen Langton, abp. of Canterbury (died 1227),² and Hugh de St. Cher (died 1263).³ The only further subdivision in Latin Bibles was the breaking up of the page into four parts, marked A, B, C, D. The verse-division was introduced by Stephanus in his edition of the Vulgate in 1555.

About the same time a critical examination of the text of the Latin Bible was undertaken at the instance of Theodulph, bp. of Orleans (A.D. 787-821).⁴

It seems an established fact that Charlemagne spent the closing years of his eventful life in the correction of the scriptures,⁵ an occupation which was then regarded as a work of piety, as is evident from the similar practice of Dunstan⁶ and Peter Damiani.⁷

But neither Alcuin's revision, nor the pious labors of Charlemagne, Dunstan, or Peter Damiani were of avail to stem the tide of corruption as long as Mss. had to be multiplied by the dangerous process of copying, which seems necessarily to entail errors of orthography, and arbitrary corrections, to say nothing of omissions and involuntary changes where the written copy reads one way and the memory suggests another, which is thoughtlessly put down. An illustration

¹ . . . propter simplicitatem fratrum colibus et commatibus ordinasse, ut qui distinctiones saecularium litterarum comprehendere minime potuerunt, hoc remedio suffulti, inculpabiliter pronuntiarent sacratissimas lectiones. — Cassiod. *de inst. div. litt.* cap. XII. ed. Migne.

² Trivetii, *Annal.* p. 182, ed. Oxon.; Balæus. *H. Eccles.* Cent. XIII., cc. 7, 10.

³ Gilb. Genebrard, *Chronol.* IV. p. 644.

⁴ Leopold Delisle, *Les Bibles de Théodulfe*, Paris, 1879.

⁵ Van Ess. p. 159, quoting Theganus, *Script. Hist. Franc.* II. p. 177.

⁶ Migne, *l. c.* vol. CXXXVII., p. 443.

⁷ Ibid. vol. CXLV., p. 334.

may be had from the double version of the Psalms in the Anglican communion, where, even in sermons and similar compositions, the familiar words of the Prayer Book are apt to displace the text of the Authorized Version. The attempts made by Lanfranc (A.D. 1089) and his disciples at correcting the Scriptures appear to have been of the same character as those of his immediate predecessors; for, though his biographer, writing in the 13th century, says that "hujus emendationis claritate omnis occidui orbis ecclesia, tam gallicana quam anglica gaudet se esse illuminatam,"¹ all traces of it appear to have been lost in subsequent obscurity. Cardinal-deacon Nicolaus (A.D. 1150) also tried his hand at the emendation of the Bible, but his success was not greater than that of the others, and of all of them it is more or less true that their efforts, though well-meant, were useless, and worse than useless, for every new correction increased the confusion.

It is proper to add here that the adoption of the Alcuinian revision seems to have been confined to the Frankish empire, since a number of Mss. belonging to the ninth, tenth, and eleventh centuries contain the Vulgate text of a different recension. The readings of this class of Mss. are preserved in the works of Peter Damiani, and seem to represent the text then current at Rome and in Italy. Such a Ms. exists in the collége of the Barnabites at Rome, and another in the Vatican Library, n. 4216, marked *Biblia monasterii S. Crucis Fontis Avellanæ*; for more on this subject see Vercellone, *l. c.* I. xix. lxxxvii. xci.; II. xviii. Evangelistaries belonging to that period are often met with; they only contain the Gospels and a table of the pericopes; lectionaries are less frequent. From a sumptuous *Evangelistarium* preserved at Echternach near Trier, written in the tenth century, Kaulen (*l. c.* p. 241) has a specimen, of which the following is a sample:—

Matth. T. X. Attendite ne iusticiam ūram faciatis coram hominibus: ut videamini ab eis. Alioquin mercedem non habebitis apud patrem ūr̄m qui in caelis est. Cum ergo facis aelemosynam noli tuba canere ante te sicut hypocritae faciunt in synagogis & in uicis: ut honorificentur ab hominibus. Amen dico vobis: receperunt mercedem suam.

From another in the cathedral at Trier, No. 139. ol. 20. not much more recent than the first, he gives (*l. c.*) this extract to illustrate the text and orthography:—

¹ Ib. CL., 55.

Matth. T. XIII. Cum autem introisset capharnaum accessit ad eum centurio rogans eum et dicens: Dne puer meus iacet in domo paralyticus et male torquetur. Et ait illi ihe: Ego ueniam et curabo eum. Et respondens centurio ait: Dne non sum dignus ut intres sub tectum meum sed tantum dic verbo et sanabitur puer meus. Nam et ego homo sub potestate habens sub me milites. Et dico huic uade et uadit. Et alio veni & venit. Et seruo meo fac hoc & facit. Audiens autem ihe miratus est et frequentibus se dixit: Amen dico vobis non inueni tantam fidem in israhel. Dico autem uobis quod multi ab oriente et occidente uenient & recumbent cum abraham & isaac & iacob in regno caelorum. Filii autem regni eicientur in tenebras exteriores ibi erit fletus & stridor dentium. Et dixit ihe centurioni: Vade & sicut credidisti fiat tibi. Et sanatus est puer in illa hora.

2. The Cistercian abbot Stephanus II. (twelfth century), of Citeaux, struck with the variant readings of an old Ms. and the current copies, took notice that the old codex gave in many places much shorter renderings than the copies in the abbey. Instead of correcting the latter by the former, which seems to have been an early, and relatively pure form of Jerome's version, he conceived the idea of consulting the originals. There was not much difficulty in the case of the N. T., but, as a Christian man of letters acquainted with Hebrew was at that time *avis rarissimus*, he sought the aid of several Jews, familiar with the Bible, requiring them to give him in French the meaning of the Hebrew and Chaldee in all places where the Latin texts were divergent, and was amazed that their renderings almost invariably agreed with the readings of the older Ms. He is believed to have discovered a means of producing a trustworthy Latin text; he selected a good copy of the Latin Bible, consisting of four parchment folio volumes, and made his corrections partly by the old codex and partly by the oral renderings of the learned Jews; he observed, moreover, the plan of erasing all words not found in the Hebrew, and designedly left the gaps vacant to remind the transcribers that the respective passages must be omitted. The copy thus corrected he declared to be the standard, which, according to the obedience of the order, must not be departed from, and by which all copies of the Bible in the whole congregation were thereafter to be made.¹

The plan of Stephanus marks the transition from the period of extravagant or unlicensed correction, or, what often means the same thing, corruption, to that of a more orderly revision, especially in two respects; the whole work was removed from the arbitrary attempts of

¹ Martianay, *Prol. in Div. Bibl. S. Hieron.* Vall. IX. p. lxxi.

individuals to the care of corporate bodies, and the original Scriptures were appealed to for fixing the Latin text. The principle, however, on which this was done, was peculiar. It was taken for granted that Jerome's version was perfect, and the object was not to produce a new version, but to restore the current text to the Hieronymian; the inquiry in dealing with different readings in the Mss. used was very simple; the reading which agreed with the original was adopted as true, for the correctors seem to have felt that it must be Jerome's. For the preservation of the text thus ascertained, the various readings were collected and critically discussed, while transcribers were required to copy out the authentic reading only. Such collections were called *Epanorthotes* or *Correctories*, and existed in two forms; at first, a copy of the Bible with ample margins was selected, and the corrections and necessary notes were set down in the margin or between the lines; copies of the Bible already made were corrected by them, and new ones made by the standard thus provided; afterwards, it was found convenient to limit the reproduction to the various readings and the notes in the shape of manuals, so that any one by the use of such a manual might correct his own copy of the Bible. But the copies of such correctories were not uniform; few were in literal agreement with the original copy, each transcriber used his own judgment, or want of judgment, in condensing or expanding the subject-matter. The Hebrew and Greek originals furnished far less material than old Mss. of the Itala and other versions, the Commentaries of Jerome, the Fathers, the *glossa interlinearia* of Rhabanus Maurus, the explanations of Walafrid Strabo and others, and the corrections covered more or less deviations in the words and syntax, as well as orthography, punctuation, and the division of sentences and verses. In difficult places the true reading was expressly attested. The following example is taken from an *epanorthotes* without text, published in *Literarisches Museum* Vol. I. Altdorf 1778, p. 30:—

Gen. I. a. In principio Aquila transtulit *in capitulo*. Item et tenebre super faciem abissi et spiritus Dei ferebatur hebr. habet vayruca heloym¹ i.e. spiritus Dei. Si esset in textu spiritus Domini hebr. haberet rucha adonai historiae autem dicunt et hebraei quod quousque homo creatus est. Deus non est appellatus DOMINUS SED Deus et hoc habent antiqui [sc. codices] Ambrosius in hexaameron spiritus Dei ferebatur cet. Syrus habet et spiritus Dei fovebat aquas i.e. vivificabat. — Matth. XVIII. d. in montibus glossa in excelsis Alias

¹ French pronunciation of the Hebrew; note *patach furtiv.* after the consonant.

tamen glossa exponit in montibus Gregor' etiam dicit super Luc' quod ubi Lucas dicit in deserto' alius evangelista dicit in montibus' quod nullus dicit nisi Matthaeus' Unde glossa, quae exponit in deserto' sumta est desuper Lucae et ibi debet esse' non hic' — Cant. Cantic. v. d. anima mea liquefacta est' ut locutus est' Subauditur dilectus' Etsi cantetur in ecclesia' non tamen est de textu' quia hebraei et antiqui non habent' sed intelligitur de versu praecedenti. — Job XIX [in carne mea videbo deum] salvatorem meum' hebr' Jeron' Philippus Gregor' et omnes antiqui non habent' hoc enim quidam scioli apponunt in textu' quod videtur facere ad fidem et quia cantatur in ecclesia' sed si apponetur iudaeis' statim exsufflarent' quia non recipiunt nisi quod habent. — ib. XXVIII, a. tempus posuit tenebris et universorum finem ipse considerat' hic fit versus propter allegoriam' gregor' et libros antiquos' qui sic habent' sed ad litteram melius punctat hebr' sic' universorum finem ipse considerat' lapidem quoque caliginis et umbram mortis ipse considerat' et dicit hebr' lapidem caliginis' i' e' saxa in corde terrae latentia' umbram mortis' infernum' et post incipit iuxta hebraeam litteram loqui de alia materia scilicet de terra Sodomorum.

The next is an example from an epanorthotes which gives the corrected and annotated matter with laconic brevity (*l. c.* p. 353) : —

Act' Ap' 9m cap.	sarone
et continuo ingressus in synag' gre [cum]	10m cap.
nec m[oderni codd.] hic hab' Saulus	petrus in superiora' gre' non habent
nec etiam paulus discipuli nocte gre'	domus
non hab' eius' sed m'	per ter
et crediderunt multi in dom' gre' non	invenit
hab' dominum' alii m' in domino	vos scitis usque ibi ad alienigenam in-
tarsum	terrogatio vel affirmatio
lidde	secundum glo[ssam] adsumus' non
invenit	assumus
	seleuciam.

Four *correctoria* have attained great celebrity, viz., the *Correctorium Parisense* or *Senonense*, that of the Dominicans, that of the Franciscans, and that which, for want of another name, may be designated that of the Sorbonne, where it was kept in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

a. The *Correct. Paris.* made in the University of Paris about A.D. 1226 probably by the joint labor of the theological faculty, exists in several copies, which however give only an abstract of various readings, apparently compiled from the marginal annotations of a Latin Bible. It seems to have widely circulated, and having received the formal approbation of the archbishop of Sens, primate of the Gallican church, is also known as *Correctorium Senonense*. Roger Baco called it in 1266 the *exemplar vulgatum*;¹ the nature of the

¹ Hody, *l. c.* p. 420.

text it furnished cannot be determined, for the extracts are too short, but it was very unsatisfactory; the last named author pronounced it for the most part horribly corrupt, and alleged that the numerous *correctores* were from sheer ignorance so many *corruptores*, instancing Mk. viii. 38 where *confusus* had been changed into *confessus*.¹

b. The *Correctorium* of the Dominicans was therefore made at the instance of Hugo a St. Caro, their provincial, by resolution of the General Chapter in A.D. 1236. The work, on which the Commission had spent twelve years, and was published as Hugo's, proved unacceptable, and he ordered the compilation of a new one, which upon completion was approved and made the standard of the order.² The original copy, in the Imperial Library at Paris,³ is written on the margin of a Latin Bible in four folio volumes, and copies of the annotations exist in different libraries.⁴ This *Correctorium*, known as that of Hugo, or of the Dominicans, or of the Preachers, possesses peculiar interest in that the text it brought was used by Albertus Magnus, Thomas Aquinas, Hugo, and other celebrated members of the order; that text is based, according to the preface, on ancient Mss. written before Charlemagne, the commentaries of Jerome, and the Hebrew, of which language the compilers seem to have had some knowledge, although the notes relating to the LXX, Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion are taken from Jerome.⁵ Roger Baco, nevertheless, does not hesitate to call this identical correction *pessima corruptio*.

c. The *Correctorium* of the Franciscans does not seem to have obtained the same influence as the others; a copy of it is preserved in the University Library at Tübingen; of another correctory, made by the Carthusians, very little is known.⁶

d. The *Correctorium* of the *Sorbonne* is in the opinion of Vercellone (*l. c.* p. 48), and Kaulen (*l. c.* p. 255), the most important of all. The only *certain* information concerning its author is that he was a Frenchman,⁷ and probably the same illustrious scholar men-

¹ See p. 117.

² Martène, *Thes. nov. anecd.* v. IV. p. 1676. — F. R. Baco, *Op. maj.* ed. Jebb. p. 49.

³ Vercellone, *Diss. Acad.* p. 46.

⁴ Vercellone, *l. c.* p. 47. *Acta Erudit.* Lips. 1690, p. 95; Carpzovii *Crit. Sac.* II, 6, 5; *Liter. Mus.* I, 13 sqq.; Rosenmüller, *Hist. interp. libr. sacr.* V. p. 239.

⁵ *Liter. Mus.* I. p. 19.

⁶ Hug, *Einleitung*, etc., I. p. 423.

⁷ This is clear from the manner in which he illustrates his positions by reference to his native tongue, e.g. Deut. XXXIII. 8: sciendum, quod hic ponitur articulus

tioned, but not by name, by Roger Baco¹; whose eminent linguistic attainments and more than forty years' study of the Scriptures made him the fittest person to undertake the revision of the text of the Latin Bible. Copies of the collected various readings are preserved in the Arsenal Library, Paris, St. Mark's Library, Venice, the Imperial Library, Vienna, the University Library, Turin, in the Vatican Library, and the College *di San Carlo a Catinari* at Rome. Vercellone's account is extremely interesting: "The author compares the text of his copy of the Latin Bible with three classes of Mss., *modern*, *ancient*, and *most ancient*, understanding by *ancient* codices, those of the Alcuinian recension, which he occasionally cites also as *Biblia Caroli Magni*, and by *most ancient*, codices older than that recension (*exemplaria ante tempora Caroli scripta*), among which he names *Biblia Gregorii M.*² As distinguished from many of his contemporaries, he clearly identifies Jerome as author of our modern Vulgate, and his rare familiarity with the subject enables him not only to identify the Latinity of Jerome, but also to avoid their error, who in correcting the Vulgate had followed the text of the Itala, or the Greek, and in that way introduced not a little confusion into that text. For the same reason he disregards the citations of the Latin Fathers taken from the Itala, as well as those portions of the Itala version which in his time continued in the liturgy, censuring those who had pursued a different course. Having collated the best and the most ancient Mss. of the Vulgate extant, *i.e.*, the Cod. *Amiatinus*, the Cod. *Vallicellianus*, and that in St. Paul *extra muros*, I can assure that the most ancient and accurate of our Mss. agree with the readings adopted in this Correctorium. Where the Latin Mss. left room for doubt, the author has consulted copies of the Hebrew and Greek originals, distinguishing the former of these not only into ancient and modern ones, but referring to them also as French or Spanish copies, nor has he omitted the use of the Chaldee Version. . . . I do not speak of his citations from rabbinical writings, or of his citations of words from St. Matthew's gospel, which he had read in Hebrew, nor of those from many Latin authors from the age of Jerome to his own, which are often not without importance, and uniformly bear witness

sicut est *le vel al* in gallico, quod non solum dativo sed etiam genitivo inservit, sicut diceremus *la chape, le mestre*, sive *al mestre*. Vercell. *l. c.*

¹ Hody, *l. c.* 430.

² Vercellone thinks that this refers to the Bibles sent to Great Britain by Gregory, while Kaulen suggests the Cod. *Amiatinus* which, according to an unsupported legend, is said to have been written by Gregory himself.

of the incredible erudition at his command, and of the correct judgment with which he applied it.”¹

After this high eulogium of so competent an author, the following examples, taken from the two volumes of his *Variae Lectiones*, in which *LXX. in Græco* designates the Septuagint, *LXX. in Latino* the Itala, *notula* an older correctorium, and *littera*, a lection or reading.

The specimens have been selected from Vercellone, *Variae Lectiones*, who has embodied in his work the readings of three correctories, designated M, N, O; of these N, no. 3466 of the Vatican, belongs to the thirteenth century, M (ottobonianovaticanus no. 293) and O (vaticanus no. 4240) to the fourteenth century. For full particulars concerning these Mss. see Vercellone in *Giornale arcadico*, vol. cxlviii, and *Atti della Pontificia academia romana d' Archeologia*, vol. xiv. He bestows special praise on the critical value of Cod. N, which he doubts not was used by the Roman correctors of the Vulgate, it having belonged to cardinal Ant. Carafa. The extracts here given fully sustain his opinion.

1. Cod. N. Gen. XVIII, 28. — Certissime hebr. et antiqui habent *quinque* non XLV., quæ littera est LXX. in græco. Si enim esset ibi XLV., nil esset interrogari utrum *propter XLV. deleret*; cum potius dicendum fuerat nonne propter XLV *parces*? Est ergo sensus: Cum de L. concesseris parcendum, nunc si quinque minus fuerint, ita ut inveniantur XLV. Si non his parcis, iam videris delere totam urbem propter quinque. Et enim piissima et efficacissima pro peccatoribus allegatio.

2. Cod. N. Gen. XLIV, 32. — Antiqua iuxta hebræum *Ego proprie servus tuus, qui in meam hunc recepi fidem*. Sensus est: ego, *servus tuus*; hoc solum dicit caussa honoris; ego, inquam, sum ille *que in meam* etc. et sic est ex parte suppositi: unde qui ponunt ibi *sim*, faciunt istud q. d. *servus tuus* esse ex parte appositi, et se iam promittit esse servum vicarium, quod ibi primo ait cum dicit *manebo itaque*.

3. Cod. O. Exod. XIV. 9. *Phihairoth*. Alii habent *Airoth*, sed videtur hoc factum vitio scriptorum, cum hebr. sit *Phiairoth* sicut supra (v. 2).

Cod. N. *Hairoth*. Sic variant antiqui: *Hiroth* est nomen vel alpium, vel vallium, vel fluminum, vel huius modi; et sunt duo vel tria nomina: *Phi* idem est quod *os*; *Hiroth* est ille locus: *Ha*, articulus, qui Gallice dicitur *le*: unde modo ponitur *Phiaroth*, modo tantum *Ahiroth*, quod dicitur *le Hiroth* sicut dicimus *Le Rone* et *Bonde le Rone*.

4. Cod. O. Num. XXIX. 35, *non faciatis*. — *Die octavo*, seu decima quinta

¹ Vercellone, *Diss. Acad.* p. 53. — The only printed correctorium is a very rare work, entitled: *Correctorium biblie cum difficilium quarundam dictionum luculenta interpretatione per Magdaliū Jacobum, Gaudensem, ord. Predicatorii, studiosissime congestum*. Colon. Quentell, 1508, 4°. Compare J. H. a Seelen, *Meditationes exeget.* I, p. 605, sq. Lübeck, 1730–37, 3 vv. 8°.

dies mensis, *omne opus servile non facietis in ea*. Hic non debere esse servile. sicut nec Lev. XXIII, ubi agitur de eadem die (v. 28): *Omne opus non facietis in tempore diei huius*; et infra (v. 31): nihil ergo operis facietis in eo.

5. Cod. M. Num. XXXIII. 3. *altera die (fecerunt) Phase. Altera die Paschæ*, id est in crastino Paschæ, ut dixit Glossa; unde non est ibi *fecerunt*, nec hebræus habet; sic enim construitur: Profecti altera die Paschæ castrametati sunt.

Cod. N. Non video bene quomodo sit ibi *fecerunt*; antiqui non (Brugensis legit *vero* pro *non*) interponunt quod dicitur *fecerunt*; sed et ipse Strabus habet *altera die post Phase profecti sunt de Ramesse*.

Cod. O. *Profecti igitur de Ramesse mense primo XV die mensis primi, altera die Phase*; suspensiva est constructio usque ibi (v. 5) *castra metati sunt*: sic enim debet construi: Profecti altera die Phase, id est in crastino Paschæ, castra metati sunt. Et hoc consonat græco qui habet *crastina Paschæ*, supple die. Per hoc patet vitium quorundam qui habent *fecerunt* altera die Phase; nam ante projectionem de Ægypto, XIII. die fecerunt. Phase, et in crastino, scilicet XV. die profecti sunt.

Cod. O. 2 Reg. I, 18. — *Et præcepit, ut docerent filios Juda arcum*, etc. Antiqui legunt: *et præcepit ut docerent filios iudæorum, sicut scriptum est in libro iustorum: Inclyti Israel etc.* Hic incipit threnus; huic autem litteræ, quæ non habet nec *arcum*, nec *planctum*, attestatur multum hebræo adhærere consuetus græcus, qui nihil habet de iis. Sed tamen dicit sic: *ut docerent filios Israel et Juda*,¹ *sicut scriptum est in libro iustorum: et dixit: Inclyti Israel etc.*² Unde secundum litteram tam græcorum, quam latinorum antiquorum supplendum est resumendo *planctum* de superioribus; *planctum*, inquam, *docerent filios Israel et Juda*, sive, *filios iudæorum*. Hieronymus³ habere dicit hebræum hanc litteram: *Et dixit ut doceret filios Juda arcum*, quod exponens ait: *Et dixit ut doceret*, subaudi Deus, *arcum*, id est, fortitudinem esse in timore Dei, quod patet in casu Saul quondam electi Domini et optimi. Putarem quod antiqui habent *filios iudæorum*, quoniam esset error scriptorum, ab eo quod fuit *filios Juda arcum*, sed video alias et diversas litteras. Communis enim habet *præcepit*, hæc habet *dixit*; communis habet *docerent*, hæc habet *doceret*, quia utrumque potest significare hebræus, quod est *ad docendum*. Dicunt tamen quia isti ceciderant ictibus sagittarum, David præcipere filios Judæ docere de arte sagittandi. Quænam videtur ista consequentia, ut exordio threni, postquam dixerat: *Planxit autem David planctum huiusmodi*, subiungatur *sicut scriptum est, ut docerent filios Juda artem sagittandi*, et statim inchoet threnum sic: *Inclyti, Israel*. Quod si aliquando erat illa doctrina determinanda, consequentius videbatur, quod sicut docti pæne ante tempora nostra quasi glossando apposuerunt *planctum*, ibi dimitteretur potius quam litteram hebræorum ante tempora translationis Hieronymi in textum interserere librorum, qui per septingentos annos ita cucurrerant. Quod si cap. XXX libri 1 Regum dicebas Hieronymum dicere quod hebræus habet *qui iussi remanserant*, nec tamen propter hoc veram litteram, quæ est, *qui lassi substituerant* mutavisti, quare hic similiter non fecisti? Sed Hieronymus exponit, inquit. Exponit quidem, sed ut litteram hebræorum. Nonne etiam

¹ So Aquila and several Mss. in Holmes and Parsons. ² Probably the Itala — so Kaulen. ³ i.e. the author of *Quæst. hebr. in Lib. Regum*. — Kaulen.

ubi dicit Hieronymus non bene habere latinos codices, illam tamen litteram, immo multas tales, nullus ausus est immutare? Require Gen. XXIII (16) et in 1 Reg. XXV (3), et 2 Reg. XIV (26). Sed dices, quod Rabanus exponit. Sed non recolis, quod Rabanus nulli litteræ hebrææ, quam exponit, vult præstare auctoritatem, ut ipse in exordio testatur? Septuaginta autem etiam in latino nec de *arcu*, nec de planctu habent aliquid, sed sic: *Et docuit Israel et dixit: curare Israel*. Quod autem ante threnum, hoc est, ante hoc verbum *Inclyti*, interponitur sic: *Et ait: Considera, Israel, pro his, qui mortui sunt super excelsa tua vulnerati*, nec hebræus nec antiqui habent, nec græcus. Quod si Rabanus glossavit, non præstitit auctoritatem ut textus esset; multo magis si postillator.

6. Cod. *N*. Deut. XXX, 7. Antiqui iuxta hebræum super *inimicos tuos, et eos, qui oderunt te et persequentur*. Resume *super*, iuxta hebræum sic *et super eos, qui oderunt te*. Unde oportet interponi quod dicitur *et* ante hoc verbum *persequentur*, quod quidam male abstulerunt, quasi illud verbum regeret quod dicitur *eos*. Hebræus autem, etiam hispanus habet *qui persequentur te*; unde, qui abstulerunt coniunctionem, totam sententiam mutaverunt. Sed *et persequuntur* pro *persequentur* posuerunt.

7. Cod. *M*. Deut. XXXII, 8. Septuaginta legunt *statuit terminos nationum iuxta numerum angelorum Dei*. Super hoc dicit Gregorius in homilia de X dragmis quas mulier habuit (I, 1606), quod tanta creditur ascensura in cælum multitudo hominum, quanta illic remansit multitudo angelorum.

While the correctories were doubtless important aids to the study of the Bible at the time of their origin, their use and value, however, at the present, are very great, for they contain numerous readings of very ancient Mss. which have long since perished. Of course we are less interested in the Latin text than in the Greek, and the Hebrew; many such readings of the Greek slumber as yet in these monuments of medieval erudition, and the Correctorium of the Sorbonne, at least, is a vast treasury of various readings for the Hebrew text, for its author must have consulted Hebrew Mss. much older than any that have come down to us.

As to the object for which they were made, viz., the establishment of a fixed standard of text of the Latin Bible, the correctories proved lamentable failures, and instead of purifying it from the gathered corruptions of so many centuries, were a fruitful source in augmenting it. Indeed it could hardly be otherwise; for given a learned apparatus of critical notes on the authenticity of certain readings and renderings on all the books of the Scriptures, and a vast army of ignorant transcribers, of whom the most ignorant were the safest, and the least ignorant the most dangerous, the result was inevitable: the mechanical transcriber produced a faithful copy, but he, possessed of a modicum of scholarship sufficient to render him conceited — and such was the typical transcriber — deemed it incumbent upon him to

indicate his preference for such readings as he thought correct, either by suppressing those he did not favor, or by smuggling into his new transcript as part of the text some unattested reading from some other source, perhaps an old Bible. Nor was this the worst case, for the practice of covering the margins of old Bibles with notes, excerpted from the correctories, opened the door to the introduction of arbitrary and unlearned corrections, which variant readings speedily found their way from the margin into the text of new copies made from those which had been annotated. In other words the correctories in the hands of the rank and file of the medieval ecclesiastic who looked upon his labors as meritorious, and mistook bigoted ignorance for piety and scholarship, were what critical commentaries are in the third quarter of the nineteenth century in the hands of uneducated preachers of whose hebdomadal deliverances some of the readers of these chapters may have had personal experience. The correctories and the critical commentaries are admirable helps in the hands of those fitted to use them, but they are most dangerous things in the hands of those of limited capacity, and still more limited culture. A graphic picture of the sad fortunes of the text of the Latin Bible in the three centuries ending with the thirteenth, may be seen in the letter of Roger Baco to Clement IV. accompanying a presentation copy of his *Opus majus*, A.D. 1267. He says: "The great mass of theologians do not know that Jerome is the author of the common translation; many flatly deny it; others again do not know which version they ought to take, and consequently each uses that which he prefers, substituting one for the other, the improper for the proper, the false for the true. But as there is only one translation in all the books of the Latin Church, to wit, that made by Jerome (the second he made in his exposition of the sacred original), the version received by the Church is greatly corrupted. For some, dealing with the writings of the holy Fathers, take no notice of the version they used. But they used the version of the Seventy; now when the Fathers cite the Scriptures in that version, these persons confound it with that contained in our present Latin Bibles, which is absolutely false. They accordingly correct and corrupt the text in this way, as is evident from the example of the raven in Genesis, which I have cited in the work accompanying this letter.¹ For the text is for the most part horribly corrupt

¹ The passage reads: "A horrible and unpardonable instance of superfluous additions occurs in Genesis VIII, where they say that the raven did *not* return to the ark, while all the Hebrew texts and ancient versions say that it *did* return." Roger Baco, *Opus maius*, ed. Lond. p. 50. This is confirmed by a correctory,

in the common copy (*exemplari vulgato*), that is, the Parisian, — and where it is not corrupt, it is uncertain; . . . and this uncertainty is due to the contention of the correctors, for there are as many correctors, or rather corrupters, as there are readers in the world . . . any one changes what he likes . . . changes according to his own caprice (*secundum caput suum*), as is evident from what I have said in the work I send along. But I will give an instance. The rendering of Mark v. (i.e. viii. 38) *Qui me confessus fuerit*, is wrong and a reading in modern homilies founded on ignorance of the propriety of ancient grammar. It ought to be *Qui me fuerit confusus*, a deponent verb with the signification of the verb *confundo*; for as *zelo*—*zeler* had the same signification, so *confundo*—*confundor* had of old the same meaning. But the modern use being different, they erased *Qui me confusus fuerit* from the sacred text, and put *qui confessus fuerit me*, the utter falsity whereof I will prove without the possibility of contradiction. For the ancient unglossed copies of the Bible throughout the church of God have Mark v. (viii. 38), *Qui me confusus fuerit*, the same as *qui me confundet*, which is the contrary of *confiteri*. And Augustine says *contra Faustum*, that when the Latin Mss. differ, recourse should be had to the most ancient Mss. and the majority (*ad antiquos et plures*). For as he there says, the ancient Mss. have greater authority than the new, and a plurality of them more than a few. The Parisian copy however is only one, but the copies in the different provinces are without number; the Parisian copy therefore must yield the place to the ancient copies both on account of its novelty and of its singularity, for in truth such singularity corrupts the truth of the whole Scriptures, etc.” (Hody, *l. c.* pp. 420, 21.) The Parisian copy referred to is the Correctory; the reading *confusus* is attested by Codd. Vercell. Veron. Brix. Vet. Vulg. and the Sixt. Clementina, while I have found *confessus* in Bryling’s Latin Bible of 1557, and the Lugdunum edition of 1562. “To this might be added innumerable instances. But the corruption springs from the fact that for the reason which follows they spend the whole day in tampering with the text. The holy fathers, and more especially Jerome, give different versions of the same passage in order to bring out the meaning. But many, not noting the difference of the renderings, regard them as different readings of the same revision, and adopt that reading which they understand best; and thus they introduce countless

which says: “Hoc antiqui latini non habent. Modo a translatione, qua utitur Augustinus, inolevit ut dicatur corvus ad arcam non redisse.” Vercell. *Varr. Lect.* I. 28, b.

blemishes.¹ The compilers of such a text, moreover, mix it as they see fit, alleging that it is customary to construct it from different versions; thus they write what they please, mixing and changing what they do not understand.² Or they adopt *ad libitum* renderings interspersed in the works of the Fathers, or even the Antiquities of Josephus, which latter only explains the Scriptures, gives the substance of the Sacred History, and accommodates the expression to suit his pleasure. Hence many of the emendations and changes introduced by modern writers are taken from Josephus, although alterations not based on ancient Mss. are simply inadmissible.³ They also take much from the church offices and introduce it into the text. But the framers of the offices introduced many changes necessitated by the requirements of the service to fix the meaning and promote edification. And the Church of Rome has the right so to do, and through her the same right belongs to other churches.⁴ On these grounds all allege the text to contain different readings, for they constantly say that another reading reads thus and thus, and these readings they multiply at every word, pretending by way of excuse that the same subject-matter might be represented in different forms. They will not own that these alleged readings are different renderings, but aver that in one case the expression is literal and in the other paraphrase, for they would give great offense, (if it became known) that the same text in the same copy consisted of different versions; hence they say that (the variants) are different readings of the same text, utterly unmindful that they might be wrong. And yet it never occurs that the same translator uses several expressions for the same subject in the same text of his version. Such a method is not allowed in philosophical and other writings; there can only be one expression of any given rendering, but different renderings have a different

¹ The Correctorium of the Dominic. has a case in point: "Job V. 26: sicut infertur acervus tritici in tempore suo. Hebr. et antiqui non habent tritici, tamen Gregor. habet: sed per expositionem magis quam per literam." Kaulen, *l. c.* p. 268.

² The Paris Correct. has this note on Apoc. VI, 11: "donec impleatur numerus conservorum eorum et fratrum eorum: anti(qui) hnt: donec compleantur conservi eorum et fratres eorum."

³ Hugo's Correct. on 2 Kings VIII, 8: "de quo fecit Salomo omnia vasa aurea in templo et mare aeneum et columnas et altare: hoc hebr. et antiqui non habent, sed sumtum est de Josepho."

⁴ Hugo, Correct. H. I. 1, 2: "Ideo adolescentulae diligunt te. non est hic nimis, quamvis cantetur in ecclesia."

These four examples are due to the researches of Kaulen, *l. c.*

expression. Their so-called different readings are accordingly different renderings, used by the Fathers in their works relating to the Scriptures, or found in Josephus, or adapted by the church to (liturgical) uses. This gives rise to endless corruption, fraught with unspeakable evil for the studies. Jerome also has explained the version of the LXX in Genesis, the Psalter and many other passages, and he calls it 'ours,' because at that time all the churches used it. For at that time he had not yet made his version from the Hebrew, which, moreover, had not yet been generally received during his life. Hence men of great reputation, and high, if not the highest, position, claim that certain places expounded by Jerome in the said works are readings of our Bible; they accordingly receive it into the text, disfiguring thereby the first version of Jerome which alone is found in our Bibles, by his second version found only in his commentaries; for they believe it to be one and the same translation. Thus they entirely change the form of the text."¹

It is evident that Hugo's knowledge of the labors of Jerome and the history of the Latin text was far from perfect, and the reader may readily correct his views by turning to the preceding chapter.²

Although the correctories, for the reasons given, did not result in the production of an absolutely uniform text, they appear to have been instrumental in furnishing one that was relatively so, as is evident from Mss. written in the 14th and 15th centuries, which, though they exhibit innumerable differences in minor points, present a much greater agreement in essentials than in Mss. written before that period. The differences, moreover, are of a national character, and warrant the division of the Mss. into certain classes of families, of which those of German and Italian origin at least disclose a Latinity colored by the idiom of Germany and Italy; how far this observation of Vercellone (*Diss. Acad.* p. 111) applies to Mss. of that period written in other countries, remains to be seen. Kaulen (*l. c.* p. 272), whose opinion deserves to be respected, assigns the origin of the term *textus vulgatus* in the modern sense, to this period, although he admits that the comparative stability of a text, so dissimilar to its original, is critically useless. It is curious in this connection to notice the phenomenon that versions into the vernacular, made in the same centuries, are based on a text much older than that found in contemporary Mss., but it is explained by the correctories which show that perfect copies of the Itala were still in use in

¹ The Latin text is given by Hody, *l. c.* p. 427.

² Still in manuscript.

the thirteenth century, and contributed not a little to the confused and composite nature of the Latin text.

The Mss. of that age are characterized by two features, the increase of vulgar expressions and spelling, and the Gothic or Black Letter in which they are written.

I. Example. From a Ms. in the University Library of Bonn (Kaulen, p. 275) : —

Prologus in librum baruch. Liber iste qui baruch nomine prænотatur. in hebraeo canone non habetur : sed tamen in vulgata edicione. Similiter et epistola iheremie prophete. Propter noticiam autem legencium hic scripta sunt : quia multa de cristo novissimis temporibus indicant. Explicit prologus. Incipit baruch. I cap. Et hec verba libri quem scripsit baruch filius nerie filij maasie filij sedechie filij sedei filij helchie in babilonia. in anno quinto in septima die mensis : in tempore quo ceperunt chaldei iherusalem et succenderunt eam igni. Et legit baruch verba libri huius ad aures ieconie filij iochim regis iuda. et ad aures universi populi venientis ad librum : et ad aures potencium filiorum regum. et ad aures presbiterorum. et ad aures populi a minimo usque ad maximum eorum habitantium in babilonia. et ad flumen sudi. Qui audientes plorabant etc.

For different readings contained in this Ms. see collation I in chapter IV on Printed Text.¹

II. From a Lectionary, not earlier than Cent. XIV, in the same library (Kaulen, p. 278) : —

In die Sco Ascens dñi Secdm Marcum. In illo t Recumbentibus undecim discipulis apparuit illis ihc & exprobrauit incredulitatem illorum et duriciam cordis quia his qui uiderant eum resurrexisse non crediderunt. Et dixit eis Euntes in mundum universum praedicate euangelium omni creaturae. Qui crediderit & baptizatus fuerit saluus erit. Qui uero non crediderit: condempnabitur. Signa autem eos qui crediderunt: haec sequentur. In nomine meo daemonia eicient: linguis loquentur nouis: serpentes tollent. Et si mortiferum quid biberint non eos nocebit. Super egros manus imponent & bene habebunt. Et dñs quidem ihc postquam locutus est eis assumptus est in celum & sedit adextris di. Illi autem profecti praedicauerunt ubiq; Dño cooperante & sermonem confirmante: sequentibus signis.

3. Roger Bacon, who has been called the Jerome of the 13th century, was unquestionably the leading thinker of that age, whose acknowledged mastery of almost every branch of learning made him the fittest, as he was the ablest, advocate of a revision of the Latin Bible. We have already noticed that in some respects at least his ideas rested on wrong premises, but on the whole they display a singularly clear understanding of the entire question as it was, and,

¹ Still in manuscript.

to a considerable extent, is yet regarded in the Latin Church. He thought the collation of ancient Mss., written in the time of Alcuin and earlier, might lead to the consummation he desired, for orthographical errors, etc., excepted, the said ancient Mss. exhibited a uniform agreement; in that he was as surely mistaken as he was in ascribing most of the discrepancies to the ignorance of transcribers, not only as to Greek and Hebrew, but also as to Latin, and in stipulating that the revisers of the Bible, besides possessing a fair knowledge of Hebrew and Greek, and a thorough acquaintance with Latin, should be well versed in rules of sound criticism, and that the revision should be made not by private effort but under papal authority.¹ His recommendations were disregarded, partly because the Church did not yet see the necessity for such revision, partly because, from the nature of the case, the production of an authoritative standard text was next to impossible, and last, not least, because duly qualified revisers were conspicuous by their absence. But towards the close of that century, which witnessed the revival of humanistic studies, attention was given to the study of Hebrew, and the biblical scholars of the period began to think that the best way of fixing the Latin text was by consulting the sacred originals, either by revising it with reference to them, or by the production of a new version. Raymond Martini, a Spanish author, wrote towards the close of the 13th century a polemical work against the Jews and Mohammedans, called *Pugio Fidei*, in which he distinctly states that he had frequently cited Scripture, neither from the Septuagint, the Vetus, nor Jerome, but from the Hebrew, because the last sustained the Christian verity far better than the Vulgate.² The commentaries of Nicolaus de Lyra, belonging to this period, doubtless contain numerous references to the Hebrew, and the views of the author are clearly set forth in the note.³

¹ See R. Baco, *Op. Maius*, ed. Jebb. pp. 44-56.

² . . . in plurimis valde S. Scripturæ locis veritatum multo planius atque perfectius haberi pro fide christiana in litera hebraica, quam in translatione nostra. Raym. Martini, *l. c.* ed. Carpzov. 1687, pp. 4, 5.

³ Postil. in Ez. I, 4: quasi species electri: dicit hic R. Sam' quod ipse nescit proprie quid significat chasmal. et ideo nescio quare Hieronym. transtulit electrum, non enim multum videtur probabile quod melius intellexerit hebraicum, quam doctor ille. — IV, 12: operies illud. in hebr. habetur coques illud. dictio enim hebr. quæ hic ponitur, æquivoca est ad operire et coquere. *hebræi tamen videntur hic melius dicere.* — XL, 31: et vestibulum eius. in heb. habetur et porticus eius ad atriam exterius. *et ideo litera nostra videtur esse corrupta per scriptores vel ignaros correctores.* — Introd. to the Commentary: Sensus literalis, a quo est incipiendum, videtur multum obfuscatus diebus modernis, partim scriptorum vitio,

A number of similar testimonies may be read in Hody, *l. c.* pp. 433, 438. Entirely *new* Latin versions of the Bible direct from the originals were made by Cardinal Adam Easton (died 1397), who translated the whole O. T. except the Psalter, and by Manetti (died 1549), who translated the N. T. and the Psalms, but the first of these works appears to have been lost, and very little is known of the second. The translation of the N. T. into Hebrew and Latin by Simon Jacumæus, at the end of the thirteenth century, has also been lost.¹ Independent versions of the Psalter were made in 1480 by Joh. Creston at Pavia, and Rud. Agricola (died 1485), at Gröningen,² but I have not been able to see them.

But the radical expedient for displacing the ancient, composite and corrupt text of the Latin Bible by a new version did not commend itself to the church in the Middle Age any more than at later periods. Revision was the aim, and in the beginning of the 15th century, it was thought that the language of the Vulgate should be conformed to classical models; of this view Laurentius Valla (died 1457) is the most conspicuous advocate in his celebrated work *De Collatione Novi Testamenti* (ed. Joh. Revius, Amstelod. 1638); specimens of his proposed improvements are given in the note.³ They remained, however, a dead letter. There is a radical difference between Roman Catholic and Protestant theologians on the subject of translations, which must not be ignored. The former hold, if Kaulen e.g. may be regarded as their spokesman, that any version that has received ecclesiastical approbation is on that account to be regarded as true, whereas the latter have ever been reluctant to admit so dangerous a

... partim imperitia aliquorum correctorum ... pro veritate literae habenda in scriptura V. T. qui de deitate christi ac de consequentibus ad hoc loquuntur. quorum aliquos Judæi corruperunt ad defensionem sui errores ... in illis autem in quibus non est verisimile quod aliquid immutaverint ... nullum videtur periculum, sed magis securum, secundum dictum b. Hieronymi, in dubiis recurrere ad textum hebræum tanquam ad originale pro veritate textus declaranda. — These citations are taken from Kaulen, *l. c.* p. 289.

¹ Cave, *Scriptt. Eccles. hist. liter.* Col. 1720, *Saec. Wicklev.* p. 58.

² Trithemii, *Opera*, ed. Francof. 1601. I, p. 377.

³ IIeb. XII, 3: ut non fatigemini animis vestris deficientes. — Melius foret *defatigamini*, h. e. labore deficiatis. *Animis* etiam pro *animabus* dixit; haud dubie elegantius *καυῆτε τὰς ψυχὰς*. — Matth. XXVI, 8: utquid perditio haec? — Eadem sunt in Marco verba quod adverbium ita compositum non memini ubi apud eruditos invenerim, quod apud Græcos nunc non, legitur, sed *in quid* sive *ad quid* εἰς τί; — v. 10: quid molesti estis mulieri? — verba graeca proprie et eleganter et ad eruditorum consuetudinem transferuntur: *quid negotii exhibetis mulieri?* h. e. quid mulierem accusatis etc.

tenet ; history, and especially that of the Vulgate, plainly shows that ecclesiastical bodies are not necessarily good translators, and that the sense of the Church ascertained from the Fathers and tradition, is not free from error. The views of Richard of Armagh (died 1359) doubtless express those of the Roman Catholic Church, but not those of Protestant divines, who consider that scholarship of the highest order, especially in the field of language and textual criticism, is the safest and truest way for ascertaining the meaning of the Sacred Originals, and for its expression in idiomatic phrase. It is difficult to understand by what other means a Church Council is able to declare a version to be Holy Scripture ; the concurrent testimony of the most competent scholars must always be the basis of such declaration, and scholarship in this respect requires to be established not by canon, but by proof. Take e.g. two or three passages from Richard of Armagh : " Concerning the discrepancies or inaccuracies of any of the three versions approved by the Church [i.e. the Itala, Jerome's version and the Vulgate] I observe . . . that the approbation of the Church respects the original meaning as expressed by the translators, and not your Ms. or mine, since both may have suffered violence from ignorant or careless transcribers. As you believe the original Scriptures to contain the truth, so you must believe it to be in every translation which, after common consultation of the Latin, Greek, Hebrew and other church-authorities, and upon careful examination and collation with copies of every other language, in which our original Scriptures did exist, the Church has received, declared canonical and recommended for use ; and you must not doubt the respective councils to have had sufficient guarantee of the person of the translators, or at least of the accuracy of the translation and its clear agreement with the original. For you are short-sighted in charging with inaccuracy or discrepancy versions that have been so carefully and diligently examined ; believe rather that the copy you may have seen has been vitiated by the ignorance of its maker. In such a case, as I have already said, you may have recourse to other ancient and corrected Mss., and if necessary, to the texts in the other tongues, and thus will doubtless discover the original meaning. The authority of Scripture renders it superfluous to take into account the names of the authors of such versions, who cannot increase its authority ; it is enough that the version contains truth and agrees with the text from which it is made. But if you meet with divergences in the original texts of the versions, it is better for you to ascribe the discovery to your want of judgment or familiarity with the different

expressions of the Scriptures, or to account for the divergence by the linguistic difference of the originals, or by the ambiguity of expressions in different languages, or by their tropical use, which is more current in one tongue than in another, than to the meaning intended by the translator, for that has upon careful examination been approved by the whole Church." And again, "Close examination of the different texts of Scripture will convince you that the different translations approved by the Church do not contradict each other in these and similar cases; although it may be proved that one of them contains less than the others, for though the version should not be a literal transfer of the original, even that cannot hurt you, if it sets forth a truth approved as aforesaid, and contains nothing in conflict with the other version or the original text. For it is not every translator's aim to render literally word for word in the order of the original, because it is not always possible to reproduce in another tongue the meaning by a strictly literal rendering, so that the translator is occasionally obliged to give the sense rather than the words."¹

Views like these may have satisfied the scruples of scholars of the 14th century, but they can only entertain those of the nineteenth, who require proof that black is white, and not a congeries of ingenious fictions, some of which struck even Kaulen as odd,² who mentions by way of apology quite a number of curious medieval notions, e.g. that Jerome's text was only found in his commentaries; that the author of the Vulgate was unknown, and that the Venerable Bede had translated the Book of Proverbs.³

NOTE. — The foregoing paper is part of a Treatise on the Latin Versions, still in manuscript, which discusses: 1. The Pre-Hieronymian Latin Texts; 2. The Hieronymian Texts; 3. The Emendations and Corrections of the Hieronymian Text; 4. The Printed Text.

The texts treated of under 1 are of the highest importance to Biblical criticism, for some of those of the New Testament doubtless belong to the sub-apostolic age, while some of those of the Old Testament probably antedate the Christian era, and furnish very ancient readings of the old *κοινή*. The recovery of some of these fragments is of singular interest, and reads more like romance than history, but history is often more romantic than fiction. The works of Rösensch and Ziegler deserve to be more widely known.

¹ See the passage in Hody, *l. c.* ² *l. c.* p. 299 sq. ³ Hody, *l. c.* pp. 267, 587.

Philo's Canon of the Old Testament and His Mode of Quoting the Alexandrian Version.¹

BY REV. B. PICK, PH.D.

WITHOUT any introduction, we at once go *in medias res*.

1. *Genesis*.

The name *Genesis* is found in *De Posteritate Caini*, § 37, and *De Mundo*, § 8. It is also quoted by the name of "Account of the Creation" in *De Post. Caini*, § 18, and *De Gigantibus*, § 5. In the latter passages the *κοσμοποιία* evidently corresponds to the ספר יצירה of Talmud, *Sanhedrin*, fol. 62. col. 2 ; *Jerus. Megilla*, ch. 7.

2. *Exodus*.

This book he quotes in *Quis Rer. Div. Her.*, § 4, 51 ; *De Somniis*, § 19. It is also quoted as *Moses' Hymn* in *Legis. Allegor.*, II. § 25, and as the *prohibitory part of the law of Moses* (ἐν τοῖς ἀπαγορευτικοῖς) in *De Confusione Ling.*, § 27.

3. *Leviticus*.

This book he quotes in *Legis Allegor.*, II. § 26 ; *Quis Rer. Div. Her.*, § 51, and in *De Plantat.*, § 6, where, however, it is a mistake, since the passage there is not found in *Leviticus*, but in *Exodus*. It is also quoted by the name of "Law concerning leprosy" (νόμος τῆς λέπρας) in *Quod Det. Potiori insid.*, § 6 ; *Quod Deus immut.*, § 26 ; *De Sobrietate*, § 10. May be that by the latter expression he meant to signify what is otherwise called by the Jews תורת כהנים, "the law of the priests."

4. *Numbers*.

This book is nowhere mentioned by its Greek name, but is quoted as *Moses' Prayer* (Μωϋσῆς εὐχόμενος) in *De Post. Caini*, § 19.

¹ Read in June, 1885.

5. *Deuteronomy.*

This book is mentioned by its name, *Legis Allegor.*, III. § 61; *Quod Deus immut.*, § 10; in *Quis Rer. Div. Her.*, § 33, 51, it is called Ἐπινομίς. Besides it is quoted as "the great song," *Legis Allegor.*, III. § 34; *Quod Det. Potiori insid.*, § 30; *De Sobrietate*, § 3; *De Post. Caini*, § 35; *De Mut. Nominum*, § 34; as "curses," *Legis Allegor.*, III. § 35; *De Post. Caini*, § 8; as "hortatory admonitions" (ἐν τοῖς προτρεπτικοῖς) *De Agricult.*, § 39; *De Profugis*, § 25; *De Mutat. Nomin.*, § 41.

Besides the expressions mentioned above, the Pentateuch is quoted by such general terms as the "law, holy scripture, holy scriptures, most holy scriptures, scriptures, scripture, oracle, sacred oracles, sacred history, books of Moses, sacred word," etc. Or the Pentateuch is quoted by "God said, Moses says, the historian says, the sacred historian says, it is written, it is said, it is stated." The expression "Moses says" is of very frequent occurrence, because, according to Philo, Moses is the prophet κατ' ἐξοθὴν, of whom he speaks in the most glowing terms. Thus he calls him "the most sincere lover of God" (ὁ θεοφιλέστατος),¹ "the God-loving" (ὁ θεοφιλής),² "the divine word of prophecy" (ὁ προφητικὸς λόγος),³ "the hierophant and prophet" (ὁ ἱεροφάντης καὶ προφήτης),⁴ "the lawgiver" (ὁ νομοθέτης),⁵ the "all-wise" (πανσόφος),⁶ the "most perfect" (ὁ τελειότατος),⁷ the "most sacred" (ὁ ἱερώτατος),⁸ the "steward and guardian of the sacred mysteries of the living God" (ὁ ταμίης καὶ φύλαξ τῶν τοῦ ὄντος ὁργίων),⁹ the "divine prophet" (θεοπρόπος),¹⁰ the "admirable" (ὁ θαυμάσιος),¹¹ the "great and wise" (ὁ μέγας πάντα),¹² the "chief priest" (ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς).¹³

6. *Joshua.*

This book is quoted, but not named.¹⁴

7. *Judges.*

This book is quoted as βίβλος τῶν κριμάτων, i.e. book of Judgments,¹⁵ and Moses is introduced as speaking.

¹ *Legis Allegor.*, II. § 22.

² *Ibid.*, § 23.

³ *Ibid.*, III. § 14; *Cong. erud. grat.*,

§ 30. ⁴ *Ibid.*, § 60.

⁵ *Quod Det. Potiori insid.*, § 3.

⁶ *Quod Det. Potiori*, § 34; *De Agricult.*, § 5, 10; *De Plantat.*, § 6.

⁷ *Quod Det. Potiori*, § 36.

⁸ *De immutab.*, § 30.

⁹ *De Plantat.*, § 6.

¹⁰ *De Ebrietate*, § 21.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, § 51.

¹² *De Sobrietate*, § 10.

¹³ *Quis Rerum div.*, § 38.

¹⁴ *De confus.*, § 32.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, § 26.

8. *Samuel.*

This book is quoted as "first book of Kings,"¹⁶ and as "sacred scripture" (ὁ ἱερὸς λόγος).¹⁷

9. *Kings.*

This book is quoted as "Kings" (ἐν ταῖς βασιλείαις).¹⁸

10. *Job.*

A quotation is made from this book by "as Job says."¹⁹

11. *Psalms.*

The Psalms were known to Philo, as may be seen from his many references to them. He speaks of the writer of the psalms,²⁰ of the psalmist,²¹ the prophet who wrote the psalms,²² the divine man in his psalms,²³ the follower of and rejoicer with Moses in his psalms,²⁴ one of the friends of Moses,²⁵ the god-like man who speaks thus in the psalms,²⁶ or refers to the psalms themselves.²⁷

12. *Proverbs.*

This book is quoted as ἐν Παροιμίαις,²⁸ and its author is quoted as one of the disciples of Moses, by name the peaceful, called in the native language Solomon.²⁹

13. *Isaiah.*

He is quoted merely as the prophet.³⁰

14. *Jeremiah.*

This prophet is quoted as the comrade of the bands of the prophets, who were inspired with sacred frenzy,³¹ or merely as prophet.³²

15. *Hosea.*

He is quoted as a prophet.³³

¹⁶ *De immut.*, § 2.

¹⁷ *De Ebrietate*, § 36.

¹⁸ *De immut.*, § 29.

¹⁹ *De mutat. nominum*, § 6.

²⁰ *De gigant.*, § 4.

²¹ *De immut.*, § 16; *De mundo*, § 3.

²² *De agricult.*, § 10.

²³ *De Plantat.*, § 7.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, § 9.

²⁵ *De confus.*, § 11.

²⁶ *De mundo*, § 6.

²⁷ *De immut.*, §§ 17, 18; *De confus.*, § 13; *De migrat.*, § 28; *De profugis*, § 11; *De mutat. nominum*, § 20; *De somniis*, §§ 13, 37, 38.

²⁸ *De Ebrietate*, § 20.

²⁹ *De Congressu*, § 31.

³⁰ *De mutat. nom.*, § 31; *De execrat.*, § 7.

³¹ *De confus.*, § 12.

³² *De profug.*, § 36.

³³ *De mutat.*, § 25.

16. *Zechariah.*

He is quoted as one of the companions of Moses.³⁴

17. *Ezra.*

This book is also referred to.³⁵

18. *Chronicles.*

This book is quoted as Scripture.³⁶

The books to which Philo does not refer are: Ezekiel, Daniel, Ruth, Esther, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, and Song of Solomon. But this is no argument against their existence and canonical rank, since he does nowhere undertake to give a list of the Scriptures, but only refers to such passages in them as serve his purpose. There can be no doubt that Philo was acquainted with the apocryphal books. Yet he never quotes them, not even for the purpose of allegorizing. He treats them with more neglect than he has even the heathen productions, *e.g.*, of Plato, Philolaus, Solon, Hippocrates, Heraclites, and others, from whose writings he often quotes entire passages.³⁷ We fully agree with Professor Siegfried, than whom at the present no one is better acquainted with Philo's writings, when he says: "His (Philo's) canon is already essentially ours."³⁸ In conclusion, we will only call attention to a reference made by Professor Briggs,³⁹ which is misleading. He says the eminent Jewish scholar, Zunz, is correct in his statement, "Neither Philo nor Josephus imparts to us an authentic list of the sacred writings." But the connection in which this passage stands will only prove our statement made above against Professor Briggs. Speaking of the Hagiographa, Zunz says: "Here an objection could be raised, that the present classification of the Hagiographical books is a later one, and that we have not what was counted to the prophets in the time of the Asmoneans, and that even Philo and Josephus, especially Ezra, the latter even appear to count Esther, Daniel, and Chronicles to the prophetic writings. Against this the following is to be considered: Neither Philo nor Josephus imparts to us an authentic list of the sacred writings. The

³⁴ *De confus. ling.*, § 14.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, § 28.

³⁶ *De congressu*, § 8. According to this, the statement of Eichhorn, *Einleitung* (4th ed. 1823), i. p. 133, adopted by Briggs, *Biblical Study*, p. 128, that

Philo did not mention Chronicles, has to be modified.

³⁷ Eichhorn, l.c., pp. 122, 123.

³⁸ *Philo*, Jena, 1875, p. 161.

³⁹ L.c., p. 130.

former, as do the New Testament and oldest Jewish authors, makes use, without any distinction, of every biblical book, the contents of which belongs to his representation, and his stylistic embellishments in quoting those books prove not the least for their position and authority."⁴⁰ Here the Jewish scholar tells us exactly what has been said before, that Philo only perused such passages as served his purpose.

How did Philo quote the Scripture? Before answering this it will be necessary to speak a few words concerning Philo's knowledge of the Hebrew. There are some who deny his knowledge of the Hebrew,⁴¹ whilst others admit that he possessed a higher or lesser degree of knowledge of that language.⁴² A third opinion is that which stands between these two extremes, that Philo the Jew understood Hebrew, but his knowledge of that language must not be measured according to our modern standard. There can also be no doubt that Philo perused the Alexandrian version, which he regarded as of equal authority with the Hebrew original,⁴³ and not the Hebrew text, as Hody⁴⁴ and Carpzov⁴⁵ think. That in spite of his perusal of the Alexandrian version there are found discrepancies in his quotations we can only understand by bearing the following in mind:—

1. *Philo often gives paraphrases but no citations; 2. Sometimes quotations are given according to the Septuagint, but at the same time with Philo's explanation; 3. In a great many cases a quotation agrees with the Septuagint in one place, but disagrees in another; 4. A great many various readings which are found in Philo are also found in manuscripts of the Septuagint; 5. Oftentimes Philo gives a better translation of the Hebrew text than the Septuagint; 6. Sometimes Philo's translation betrays another Hebrew text than that of the Septuagint; 7. Sometimes we find the more common usage of the Greek language, or Philo avoids Hebraisms, non-Greek constructions of the Septuagint; 8. Often many passages are quoted as one; 9. Sometimes it appears that Philo has been corrected by later writers, according to the text of the Septuagint.*

⁴⁰ *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge*, Berlin, 1832, p. 18.

⁴¹ Scaliger, *animadverss. ad Eusebii Chronicen.*, p. 7, *epist. I. 13, de sectis Judaicis, cap. 18, init.*, says: "Hebraismi et Syriasmis imperitior fuit Philo quam ullus Gallus vel Scythia." Of the same opinion is Huetius, *Demonstr. evang.*, p. 251^a; Mangey, *Praefatio*, p. 16.

⁴² Loesner, *Lectio. Philon. spec.*, § 12, p. 116 ff.; Michaelis, *De Chronol. Mosis post diluvium*, p. 164; Horne-mann, *Spec. exercitatt. in LXX. ex Philone*, p. 24 sq.

⁴³ *De Vita Mosis*, II. 7.

⁴⁴ *De biblior. textibus original*, p. 195.

⁴⁵ *Exercitatt. sacrae prolegg.*, p. 36.

In the following list of quotations we follow the order of the Septuagint, illustrating the quotations by such remarks as the case may require. The references are to Richter's edition of Philo; and, for the benefit of the student, we have also given the number of the volume and page:—

Gen. 1, 5. Sept. καὶ ἐκάλεσεν ὁ θεὸς τὸ φῶς ἡμέραν . . . *quis verum divin. haer.* 33 (vol. III. p. 32), ὁ θεὸς is wanting.

“ 1, 24. Sept. and Philo *leg. alleg.* II. 4 (vol. I. p. 95), read: ἐξαγαγέτω ἡ γῆ ψυχὴν ζῶσαν κατὰ γένος, τετράποδα καὶ ἑρπετὰ καὶ θηρία . . . but *de mundi orif.* 21 (I. p. 21), Philo reads: ἐξαγαγέτω ἡ γῆ κτήνη καὶ θηρία καὶ ἑρπετὰ καθ' ἕκαστον γένος. An examination of the different manuscripts of the Septuagint shows that they are here at variance with regard to the one or the other reading.

“ 1, 26. Sept. εἶπεν ὁ θεὸς . . . *De confus. ling.* 33 (vol. II. p. 284) εἶπεν κύριος ὁ θεός.

“ 1, 31. Sept. καλὰ λίαν . . . Philo: *quis rer. div. haer.* 32 (III. p. 36), ἀγαθὰ σφόδρα = טוב מאד.

“ 2, 1. Sept. συνετέλεσθησαν, Philo: *ibid.* 24 (III. p. 25), συνετέλεσεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν, but *leg. alleg.* I, 1 (I. p. 60), καὶ ἐτετέλεσθησαν οἱ οὐρανοὶ καὶ ἡ γῆ.

“ 2, 2. Sept. συνετέλεσεν . . . ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἕκτῃ τὰ ἔργα ἃ ἐποίησε . . . *leg. alleg.* I, 2 (I. p. 60), συνετέλεσεν ἕκτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τὰ ἔργα, but in *de septen.* 6 (p. 25), where Philo speaks of the ἱερὰ ἐβδόμη, he says: Μωϋσῆς δὲ ἀπὸ σεμνοτέρου πράγματος ἐκάλεσεν αὐτὴν συντέλειαν καὶ παντέλειαν· ἐξάδι μὲν τὴν γένεσιν τῶν τοῦ κόσμου μερῶν ἀναθεῖς, ἐβδομάδι δὲ τὴν τελείωσιν (*i.e.* but Moses, from a most honorable cause, called it consummation and perfection, “attributing to the number six the origination of all the parts of the world, and to the number seven their perfection”), as if he had read Gen. 2, 2, corresponding to the Hebrew text: καὶ συνετέλεσεν ὁ θεὸς ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἐβδόμῃ. As to the reading of the Sept. ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἕκτῃ, we know from the Talmud, that this is one of the changes the translators of the Alexandrian version made to avoid the apparent contradiction, since God did not work on the seventh day.

“ 2, 4. Sept. ὅτε ἐγένετο . . . *leg. alleg.* I, 8 (I. p. 64), ὅτε ἐγένοντο = בַּהֲבֵרָאם.

- Gen. 2, 5. Sept. καὶ ἄνθρωπος οὐκ ἦν ἐργάζεσθαι αὐτὴν . . . *leg. alleg.* I, 9 (I. p. 65), τὴν γῆν instead of αὐτὴν; the reading of Philo is also found in some codd.
- " 2, 7. Sept. ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς . . . *leg. alleg.* I, 12 (I. p. 67), ἀπὸ τῆς χθονὸς = **מִן הָאֲדָמָה**, which expresses the Hebrew better than the Sept., since γῆ generally stands for **אֲרֶץ**.
- " 2, 14. Sept. οὗτος ὁ προπορευόμενος . . . *leg. alleg.* I, 19 (I. p. 76), πορευόμενος, as some codd. of the Sept.
- " 2, 15. Sept. καὶ ἐθέτο αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ τῆς τρυφῆς . . . *leg. alleg.* I, 28 (I. p. 83), τῆς τρυφῆς omitted, as in some codd. of the Sept.
- " 2, 17. Sept. ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ ξύλου τοῦ γινώσκειν καλὸν καὶ πονηρὸν . . . agreeing with *leg. alleg.* I, 32 (I. p. 86), but *ibid.* 29 (I. p. 83), ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ ξύλου τοῦ εἰδέναι γνωστὸν καλοῦ καὶ πονηροῦ.
- " 2, 19. Sept. καὶ πᾶν ὃ ἐὰν ἐκάλεσεν αὐτὸ Ἀδὰμ ψυχὴν ζῶσαν, τοῦτο ὄνομα αὐτῷ . . . *mut. nom.* 9 (III. p. 170), πάντα ὃ ἂν ἐκάλεσεν ὁ Ἀδὰμ τοῦτο ὄνομα τοῦ κληθέντος ἦν, a paraphrase.
- " 2, 21. Sept. καὶ ἀνεπλήρωσε σάρκα κ.τ.λ. . . . *leg. alleg.* 2, 11 (I. p. 101), ἀνεπλήρον δὲ σάρκα.
- " 2, 24. Sept. καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο . . . agreeing with *de gigant.* 15 (II. p. 63), but *fragm.* (VI. p. 210), οἱ is wanting.
- " 2, 24. εἰς σάρκα μίαν . . . agreeing with *de gigant.* l.c., but *quaestt. in Genes*, I, 29 (VI. p. 265), *in carne una*.
- " 3, 8. Sept. καὶ ἐκρύβησαν . . . agreeing with *leg. alleg.* III. 2 (I. p. 128), but *ibid.* III. 1 (I. p. 126), καὶ ἐκρύβη ὁ τε Ἀδὰμ καὶ ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ.
- " 3, 14. Sept. θηρίων τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς . . . *leg. alleg.* III. 35 (I. p. 156), θηρίων τῆς γῆς.
- " 3, 14. Sept. κύριος ὁ θεὸς . . . *leg. alleg.* III. 19 (I. p. 142), ὁ θεός.
- " 3, 14. Sept. ἐπὶ τῷ στήθει σου . . . *leg. alleg.* III. 21 (I. p. 144), σου omitted.
- " 3, 14. Sept. γῆν φαγῇ . . . *leg. alleg.* III. 55 (I. p. 169), γῆν φάγεσαι.
- " 3, 17. Sept. τοῦτον μόνον . . . so *leg. alleg.* III. 88 (I. p. 194), but omitted *ibid.* 79 (I. p. 188).
- " 3, 19. Sept. ἕως τοῦ ἀποστρέψαι . . . *fragm.* (VI. p. 208), ἕως τοῦ ἐπιστρέψαι, which expresses more correct the **עַד-שׁוּבָה**.
- " 3, 20. Sept. Ζωή . . . *quis rer. div. haer.* 11 (III. p. 15), Ζωήν.

- Gen. 3, 20. Sept. ὅτι μήτηρ, *ibid.* ὅτι αὕτη μήτηρ = **כִּי הָיָה הַיָּתֵה אִם**.
- “ 3, 22. Sept. εἰς ἑξ ἡμῶν . . . *conf. lingu.* 33 (II. p. 284), ἑξ omitted.
- “ 3, 24. Sept. κατώκισεν αὐτὸν . . . *Cherub.* 1 (I. p. 198), αὐτὸν omitted.
- “ 4, 1. Sept. Εὖαν τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ . . . *Cherub.* 12 (I. p. 208), Εὖαν omitted.
- “ 4, 1. Sept. καὶ συλλαβοῦσα ἔτεκε . . . *ibid.* συνέλαβε καὶ ἔτεκε, so the Alex. text of the Sept.
- “ 4, 3. Sept. θυσίαν . . . *de sacr. Ab. et C.* 13 (I. p. 142), δῶρον.
- “ 4, 8. Sept. εἰς τὸ πεδῖον . . . *quod det. pot. insid.* 1 (I. p. 268), ἐπὶ τὸ πεδῖον.
- “ 4, 9. Sept. ποῦ ἐστὶν Ἀβελ . . . *ibid.* 17 (I. p. 284), ἐστὶν omitted.
- “ 4, 10. Sept. τί πεποίηκας . . . *ibid.* 20 (I. p. 287), ἐποίησας, as a number of Mss. of the Sept. read.
- “ 4, 11. Sept. ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς . . . *ibid.* 26 (I. p. 294), ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, but *de agricult.* 5 (II. p. 109), ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς.
- “ 4, 12. Sept. ὅτε ἐργᾷ τὴν γῆν . . . *de agricult.* 5 (II. p. 109), ἥ ἐργᾷ.
- “ 4, 13. Sept. πρὸς κύριον τὸν θεὸν . . . *quod det. pot. insid.* 39 (I. p. 305), τὸν θεὸν is wanting, as in some codd. of the Sept.
- “ 4, 13. Sept. μείζων ἢ αἰτία μου τοῦ ἀφεθῆναι με . . . *ibid.*, με is wanting.
- “ 4, 14. Sept. εἰ ἐκβάλλεις . . . *ibid.* 41 (I. p. 307), 45 (I. p. 311), ἐκβαλεῖς, with some codd. of the Sept.
- “ 4, 15. Sept. οὐχ οὕτω . . . *ibid.* 45 (I. p. 312), οὐχ οὕτω φρονεῖς ὡς λέγεις.
- “ 4, 15. Sept. εὗρίσκοντα αὐτὸν . . . *de profugis* 11 (III. p. 123) αὐτὸν omitted.
- “ 4, 21. Sept. Ἰουβάλ οὗτος ἦν ὁ καταδείξας ψαλτήριον καὶ κιθάραν . . . *de post. Caini*, 31 (II. p. 28), ὁ δὲ Ἰωβάλ οὗτος ἐστὶ πατήρ ὁ παταδείξας κ.τ.λ. = **אָבִי כָל־תִּפְשׁ**.
- “ 4, 26. Sept. οὗτος ἤλπισεν ἐπικαλεῖσθαι τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ . . . *de Abrahamo* 2 (IV. p. 6), οὗτος ἤλπισεν ἐπὶ τὸν τῶν ὄλων πατέρα καὶ ποιητὴν (a citation with Philo's explanation).
- “ 6, 2. Sept. ἰδόντες δὲ υἱοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ . . . *de gigant.* 2 (II. p. 52), ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ ἄγγελοι τοῦ θεοῦ, that is the reading also of some codd. of the Sept.

- Gen. 6, 3. Sept. οὐ μὴ καταμείνῃ τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις . . . τούτοις . . . *de gigant.* 5 (II. p. 54), οὐ καταμείνῃ . . . ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις.
- " 6, 5. Sept. ἐπὶ τὰ πονηρὰ . . . *conf. lingu.* 7 (II. p. 254), τὰ πονηρὰ.
- " 6, 9. Sept. τέλειος ὢν . . . *de Abrah.* 7 (VI. p. 10), ὢν is wanting.
- " 6, 11. Sept. ἐπλήσθη ἡ γῆ ἀδικίας . . . *quod deus immut.* 26 (II. p. 91), ἡ γῆ is wanting.
- " 6, 14. Sept. νοσσιᾶς ποιήσεις τὴν κιβωτὸν . . . *quaestt. in Genes.* II. 3 (VI. p. 306), *nidos nidos facies arcam*; whether the original Hebrew read **קנים קנים תעשה אתהתבה**, as Lagarde, *onomastica sacra*, II. 95, would emend the massoretic text, is difficult to tell.
- " 7, 11. Sept. ἐρράγησαν πᾶσαι αἱ πηγαὶ . . . *de profug.* 34 (III. p. 151), ἀπεκαλύφθησαν δὲ αἱ πηγαί.
- " 7, 11. Sept. ἠνέψχθησαν . . . *ibid.* ἀνέψχθησαν.
- " 8, 20. Sept. ἀνήμεκεν εἰς ὀλοκάρπωσιν . . . *quaestt. in Gen.* II. 52 (VI. p. 346), *obtulit holocarpomata* (Heb. **ויעל עלת**).
- " 8, 21. Sept. ἐπιμελῶς . . . *ibid.* II. 54 (VI. p. 347), *diligenter jugiterque*.
- " 9, 11. Sept. πρὸς ὑμᾶς . . . *de somniis* 2, 33 (III. p. 309), πρὸς σὲ; perhaps he read **אתך** for **אתכם**.
- " 9, 21. Sept. καὶ ἐμεθύσθη καὶ ἐγυμνώθη *de agricult.* 1 (II. p. 105), καὶ ἐγυμνώθη is wanting.
- " 9, 26. Sept. εὐλόγητος . . . agreeing with *de sobriet.* 11 (II. p. 242), but *ibid.* p. 244: εὐλογημένος καὶ ἔσται Χαναὰν παῖς οἰκέτης αὐτοῦ . . . *ibid.* p. 243: καὶ ἔσται X. δοῦλος αὐτοῖς = **עבד למו**.
- " 9, 27. Sept. καὶ γενηθήτω Χαναὰν παῖς αὐτοῦ . . . *de sobriet.* 12 (II. p. 244), καὶ γενέσθω X. δοῦλος αὐτοῖς.
- " 10, 9. Sept. οὗτος ἦν γίγας . . . *de gigant.* 15 (II. p. 63), οὗτος ἥρξατο εἶναι γίγας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.
- " 11, 3. Sept. τῷ πλήσιον αὐτοῦ . . . *de confus. ling.* 1 (II. p. 248), αὐτοῦ is omitted.
- " 11, 4. Sept. πρὸ τοῦ διασπαρῆναι . . . agreeing with *ibid.*, but *ibid.* 24 (p. 274), πρὶν διασπαρῆναι.
- " 11, 4. Sept. ἐπὶ προσώπου . . . *ibid.* 1 (p. 248), ἐπὶ πρόσωπον.
- " 12, 1. Sept. is paraphrased in the following manner *in leg. alleg.* III. 27 (I. 148): κελεύει αὐτῷ πατρίδος καὶ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης ξενουῖσθαι καὶ γῆν οἰκεῖν ἣν αὐτὸς δῶ ὁ θεός.

- Gen. 12, 1. Sept. καὶ δεῦρο εἰς τὴν γῆν . . . *migrat. Abr.* 1 (II. p. 292), and *quis rer. div. haer.* 56 (III. p. 61), καὶ δεῦρο is wanting, thus agreeing with the Hebr.; in the latter passage the reading is also πρὸς τγ. ἦν ἂν σοι δείξω . . . agreeing with *quis rer. div. haer.* l.c., but ἂν is wanting in *migrat. Abr.* l.c.
- " 12, 7. Sept. καὶ ὥφθη κύριος τῷ Ἀβραὰμ . . . *de Abrah.* 17 (IV. p. 20), ὥφθη δὲ ὁ θεὸς τῷ Ἀβρ.
- " 12, 36. Sept. εὐλογημένος . . . *de migr. Abr.* 1 (II. p. 292), εὐλογητός.
- " 15, 2. Sept. δέσποτα κύριε τί μοι δώσεις . . . *quis rer. div. haer.* 1 (III. p. 5), τί μοι δέσποτα δώσεις.
- " 15, 2. Sept. ἐγὼ δὲ ἀπολύομαι ἄτεκνος . . . *ibid.* l.c., ἐγὼ δὲ ἀπελεύσομαι (Hebr. **וְיָלֵךְ**).
- " 15, 4. Sept. φωνὴ κυρίου . . . *ibid.* 13 (III. p. 17), φωνὴ θεοῦ.
- " 15, 4. Sept. λέγουσα . . . *ibid.*, τῷ λέγειν.
- " 15, 5. Sept. εἰ δυνήσῃ . . . *ibid.* 17 (p. 21), εἰ δυνήσῃ.
- " 15, 6. Sept. καὶ εὐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην . . . *leg. allegor.* III. 81 (I. p. 189), paraphrastically καὶ δίκαιος ἐνομήσθη.
- " 15, 11. Sept. ἐπὶ τὰ σώματα ἐπὶ τὰ . . . *quis rer. div. haer.* 49 (III. p. 52), ἐπὶ τὰ σώματα τὰ, so many codd. of the Sept.
- " 15, 12. Sept. ἐπέπεσε τῷ Ἀβραμ . . . *ibid.* 51 (p. 55), ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ Ἀβραὰμ; *ibid.* 52 (p. 57), ἐπέπεσεν ἐπὶ τὸν Ἀβραάμ, Hebr. **עָלָה**.
- " 15, 15. Sept. ἐν εἰρήνῃ . . . *ibid.* 56 (p. 61), μετ' εἰρήνης.
- " 15, 17. Sept. ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν διχοτομημάτων τούτων . . . *ibid.* 61 (p. 68), μέσον τῶν διχοτομημάτων.
- " 15, 18. Sept. ἕως τοῦ ποταμοῦ τοῦ μεγάλου Εὐφράτου . . . *ibid.* 62 (p. 69), ἕως τοῦ ποταμοῦ τοῦ μεγάλου ποταμοῦ Εὐφράτου, Hebr. **עַד-הַנָּהָר הַגָּדוֹל נְהַר-פְּרָת**.
- " 16, 3. Sept. τῷ Ἀβραμ ἀνδρὶ αὐτῆς αὐτῷ γυναικῇ . . . *congr. erud. grat.* 14 (III. p. 85), τ. Ἀβρ. τῷ αὐτῆς ἀνδρὶ αὐτῷ εἰς γυναικῇ (Hebr. **לְאִשָּׁה**).
- " 16, 5. Sept. ἐναντίον αὐτῆς . . . *ibid.* 25 (p. 99), ἐνώπιον αὐτῆς.
- " 16, 7. Sept. ἐν ὁδῷ Σούρ. . . *profug.* 22 (III. p. 135), καθ' ὁδὸν Σούρ.
- " 16, 11. Sept. καὶ τέξῃ υἱὸν . . . *ibid.* 37 (III. p. 153), καὶ τέξεις παιδίον.
- " 17, 16. Sept. εὐλογήσω αὐτὸ καὶ ἔσται εἰς ἔθνη . . . *mut. nom.* 27 (III. p. 186), εὐλογήσω αὐτὴν . . . (Hebr. **בְּרַכְתִּיהָ**).
- " 17, 16. Sept. βασιλεῖς ἐθνῶν ἐξ αὐτοῦ . . . *ibid.* 28 (p. 187), ἐξ αὐτῆς (Hebr. **מִמֶּנָּה**).

- Gen. 17, 19. Sept. τέξεται σοι . . . *ibid.* 44 (p. 208), σοι is wanting, but retained *ibid.* 45 (p. 210).
- " 17, 20. Sept. καὶ πληθυνῶ αὐτὸν σφόδρα . . . *ibid.* 45 (p. 210), καὶ αὐτὸν σφόδρα is wanting.
- " 18, 9. Sept. τοῦ Σάρρα ἡ γυνή σου . . . *quod det. potiori insid.* 17 (I. p. 284), τοῦ ἐστὶ σοι ἡ ἀρετή.
- " 18, 12. Sept. ἐγέλασε ἐν ἑαυτῇ λέγονσα . . . *leg. alleg.* III. 77 (I. p. 187), ἐγέλασε τῇ διανοίᾳ καὶ εἶπεν.
- " 18, 12. Sept. οὐπω μὲν μοιγέγονεν ἕως τοῦ νῦν . . . *ibid.* οὐπω μοιγέγονεν τὸ εὐδαιμονεῖν ἕως τοῦ νῦν.
- " 18, 16. Sept. συνεπορεύετο μετ' αὐτῶν . . . *migr. Abr.* 31 (II. p. 330), μετ' αὐτῶν is wanting.
- " 18, 22. Sept. ἐστηκὼς ἐναντίον κυρίου . . . *de cherub.* 6 (I. p. 203), agrees with the Sept., but *leg. allegor.* III. 3 (I. p. 128), ἐν τόπῳ κυρίου.
- " 19, 35. Sept. ἐν τῷ κοιμηθῆναι αὐτὸν . . . *de ebriet.* 49 (II. p. 225), ἐν τ. κ. αὐτὰς.
- " 21, 16. Sept. τοῦ παιδίου μου . . . *ibid.* 2 (II. p. 233), μου is wanting, agreeing with the Hebrew.
- " 21, 33. Sept. κυρίου, θεὸς αἰώνιος . . . *de plant.* 18 (II. p. 159), κυρίου θεοῦ αἰώνιον.
- " 22, 2. Sept. καὶ πορεύητι εἰς τὴν γῆν ὑψηλὴν . . . *de somn.* I. 34 (III. p. 256), is wanting.
- " 22, 2. Sept. καὶ ἀνένεγκε αὐτὸν ἐκεῖ εἰς ὀλοκάρπωσιν ἐφ' ἐν τῶν ὀρέων ὧν ἄν σοι εἶπω . . . *ibid.*, only the words καὶ ἀνένεγκε.
- " 26, 4. Sept. καὶ δικαιώματά μου καὶ τὰ νόμιμά μου . . . *quis r. d. h.* 2 (III. p. 6), καὶ τοὺς νόμους μου καὶ τὰς κρίσεις.
- " 27, 20. Sept. ὁ θεὸς σου . . . *de sacr. Ab. et l.* 17 (I. p. 246), σου is wanting, as in some codd. of the Sept.
- " 27, 33. Sept. σφόδρα . . . *quis rer. d. h.* 51 (III. p. 55), σφόδρα is wanting.
- " 27, 42. Sept. ἀπειλεῖ σοι τοῦ ἀποκτεῖναι σε . . . *de profug.* 4 (III. p. 115), σοι τοῦ is wanting.
- " 27, 43. Sept. εἰς τὴν Μεσοποταμίαν . . . *ibid.* is wanting, corresponding to the Hebrew.
- " 27, 44. Sept. τὸν θυμὸν καὶ τὴν ὀργὴν . . . *ibid.* only τὴν ὀργὴν, like the Hebr.
- " 27, 45. Sept. ἀπὸ σοῦ . . . *ibid.* wanting.
- " 28, 7. Sept. Συρίας . . . *cong. erud. grat.* 13 (III. p. 85), is wanting.

- Gen. 28, 11. Sept. ἐκοιμήθη . . . *de somn.* I, 1 (III. p. 215), ἡγλίσθη = ילן of the Hebrew.
- " 28, 13. Sept. ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ . . . *ibid.* I, 25 (III. p. 248), 27 (p. 249), 28 (p. 251), ἐγὼ κύριος ὁ θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ, cp. the Hebrew אנכי יהוה אלהי א.
- " 28, 14. Sept. ὡς ἡ ἄμμος τῆς γῆς . . . *ibid.* I, 1 (III. p. 215), ὡς ὁ χοῦς τ. γ., corresponding better with the כעפר הארץ, because ἄμμος corresponds more with חול.
- " 28, 16. Sept. ἐξηγέρθη ἐκ τοῦ ὕπνου . . . *ibid.* I, 31 (III. p. 253), ἐκ τοῦ ὕπνου is wanting.
- " 31, 10. Sept. ἐν γαστρὶ λαμβάνοντα . . . *ibid.* II. 3 (III. p. 273), is wanting.
- " 31, 43. Sept. αἱ θυγατέρες θυγατέρες μου καὶ υἱοὶ υἱοὶ μου καὶ τὰ κτήνη κτήνη μου . . . *cherub.* 21 (I. p. 214), θυγατέρες, υἱοὶ, κτήνη only once expressed.
- " 37, 2. Sept. ποιμαίνων τὰ πρόβατα τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ μετὰ τῶν ἀδελφῶν αὐτοῦ . . . *quod deus immut.* 25 (II. p. 90), ποιμαίνων μετὰ τῶν ἀδελφῶν τὰ πρόβατα; cp. Hebr. רעה את-אחיו בצאן.
- " 37, 9. Sept. ἰδοὺ ἐνύπνιασάμην ἐνύπνιον ἕτερον . . . *de somn.* II. 16 (III. p. 288), is wanting.
- " 37, 10. Sept. ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ . . . *ibid.*, αὐτοῦ is wanting, so likewise αὐτῷ and τοῦτο.
- " 37, 11. Sept. οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ . . . *ibid.* αὐτοῦ.
- " 37, 13. Sept. οὐχὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί σου . . . *quod det. pot. insid.* 4 (I. p. 271), ἰδοὺ οἱ ἀδ. σ.
- " 37, 13. Sept. εἰς Συχέμ . . . *ibid.* 2 (p. 270), ἐν Συχέμ = בשכם.
- " 37, 36. Sept. τῷ Πετεφρῇ . . . *de ebriet.* 51 (II. p. 227), is wanting.
- " 38, 25. Sept. οὗτινος ταυτὰ ἐστὶν ἐγὼ ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχω . . . *mut. nom.* 23 (III. p. 183), οὗτινος ταῦτ' ἐστὶν ἐξ ἐκείνου ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχω.
- " 38, 26. Sept. θάμαρ ἢ ἐγώ . . . *ibid.* (p. 184), is wanting.
- " 38, 26. Sept. οὐ ἕνεκεν . . . *ibid.*, ἥς ἕνεκα αἰτίας.
- " 39, 1. Sept. ὁ Πετεφρῆς . . . *de ebriet.* 51 (II. p. 227), is wanting.
- " 40, 3. Sept. καὶ ἔθετο αὐτούς ἐν φυλακῇ . . . *ibid.* καὶ ἔθετο αὐτοὺς ἐν φυλακῇ παρὰ τῷ ἀρχιμαγείρῳ.
- " 40, 11. Sept. εἰς τὴν χεῖρα . . . *de somn.* II. 23 (III. p. 297), εἰς τὰς χεῖρας, as some codd. of the Sept.

- Gen. 41, 20. Sept. αἱ ἑπτὰ βόες . . . *ibid.* II. 32 (III. p. 308), ἑπτὰ omitted.
- “ 41, 23. Sept. ἐχόμενοι αὐτῶν . . . *ibid.*, αὐτῶν is wanting.
- “ 41, 24. Sept. τοὺς ἑπτὰ στάχνας . . . *ibid.* is wanting.
- “ 43, 10. Sept. ἤδη ἂν ὑπεστρέψαμεν δὲς . . . *quis r. div. h.* 51 (III. p. 56), δὲς is wanting.
- “ 45, 18. Sept. τὸν μυελὸν τῆς γῆς . . . *de mut. nom.* 33 (III. p. 192), τῶν μυελῶν γῆς.
- “ 46, 27. Sept. πᾶσαι ψυχαὶ οἴκου Ἰακώβ . . . ψυχὰς ἐβδομήκοντα πέντε . . . *migr. Abr.* 36 (II. p. 336), ἦσαν αἱ πᾶσαι ψυχὰς ἐξ Ἰακώβ πέντε καὶ ἐβδομήκοντα.
- “ 48, 5. Sept. οἱ γενόμενοί σοι . . . *mut. nom.* 16 (III. p. 176), σοι is wanting.
- “ 48, 5. Sept. πρὸς σὲ . . . *ibid.* wanting.
- “ 48, 15. Sept. ἔως τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης . . . agreeing with *leg. alleg.* III. 62 (I. p. 174), but wanting in *de conf. ling.* 36 (II. p. 287), and *de profug.* 13 (III. p. 124).
- Exod. 2, 19. Sept. ποῦ ἔστιν . . . *mut. nom.* 20 (III. p. 181), ποῦ ἔστιν ὁ ἄνθρωπος.
- “ 2, 22. Sept. πάροικος . . . *conf. ling.* 17 (II. p. 266), γειώρας.
- “ 3, 4. Sept. εἶδε κύριος . . . *de somn.* I, 34 (III. p. 255), κύριος is wanting.
- “ 3, 4. Sept. ἐκάλεσεν αὐτὸν κύριος ἐκ τοῦ βάρου . . . *ibid.*, ὁ θεὸς ἐκ τῆς βάρου, cp. Hebr. אלהים.
- “ 4, 14. Sept. λαλῶν λαλήσει . . . *quod det. pot. insid.* 34 (I. p. 301), λαλῶν is wanting.
- “ 6, 26. Sept. ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου . . . *mut. nom.* 37 (III. p. 199), ἐξ Αἰγύπτου.
- “ 6, 27. Sept. πρὸς Φαραὼ βασιλεῖ . . . *ibid.*, Φαραῶ βασιλεῖ, so likewise 6, 29, in *mut. nom.* 3 (III. p. 161).
- “ 7, 1. Sept. δέδωκα . . . *migr. Abr.* 15 (II. p. 310), δίδωμι.
- “ 7, 15. Sept. καὶ ἔσθ . . . *conf. ling.* 9 (II. p. 255), σύ δὲ στήσῃ; *somn.* II. 42 (III. p. 319), καὶ στήσῃ, and so also some codd. of the Sept.
- “ 8, 1. Sept. ἵνα μοι λατρεύωσιν . . . *conf. ling.* 20 (II. p. 268), ἵνα με θεραπεύῃ.
- “ 15, 17. Sept. εἰς ἔτοιμον κατοικητήριόν σου ὃ κατηρτίσω κύριε . . . *de plantat.* 12 (II. p. 154), ἔδρασμα εἰς κάθედραν σου κατειργάσω, κύριε, more in accordance with the Hebrew מִכֵּן לְשִׁבְתְּךָ פָּעַלְתָּ יְהוָה.

- Exod. 15, 23. Sept. *πιεῖν . . . congr. erud. grat.* 29 (III. p. 104), *πιεῖν ὕδωρ*, cp. Hebr. **לשתת מים**.
- " 15, 25. Sept. *κρίσεις . . . ibid.*, *κρίσιν*, cp. Hebr. **משפט**.
- " 16, 15. Sept. *οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ . . . leg. alleg.* III. 59 (I. p. 172), is wanting.
- " 18, 4. Sept. *ὁ θεὸς τοῦ πατρὸς μου . . . quis r. d. h.* 12 (III. p. 16), *ὁ θεός μου*, as if Philo read **אלהי**.
- " 19, 19. Sept. *φωνῇ . . . ibid.* 5 (III. p. 7), *ἐν φωνῇ* = **בקול**.
- " 20, 5. Sept. *ἀμαρτίας . . . sobriet.* 10 (II. p. 242), *ἀνομίας* = **עון**.
- " 20, 5. Sept. *ἕως τρίτης καὶ τετάρτης γενεᾶς . . . ibid.*, *ἐπὶ τρίτους καὶ τετάρτους*, cp. **על-שלישים ועל-רבעים**.
- " 20, 23. Sept. *οὐ ποιήσετε ὑμῖν αὐτοῖς θεοὺς . . . leg. alleg.* I, 15 (I. p. 72), *οὐ ποιήσετε μετ' ἐμοῦ θεοὺς*, **לא תעשון אתי**.
- " 24, 11. Sept. *καὶ τῶν ἐπιλέκτων τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ οὐ διεφώνησεν οὐδὲ εἰς . . . conf. ling.* 13 (II. p. 261), *γένος γὰρ ἔσμεν τῶν ἐπιλέκτων τοῦ τὸν θεὸν ὀρῶντος Ἰσραὴλ ὧν διεφώνησεν οὐδὲ εἰς*. This is a quotation together with an explanation.
- " 25, 2. Sept. *λάβετε . . . quis r. d. h.* 23 (III. p. 28), *λάβετε μοι* = **ויקח-לי**.
- " 25, 2. Sept. *παρὰ πάντων . . . ibid.* is wanting.
- " 25, 40. Sept. *ὅρα ποιήσεις κατὰ τὸν τύπον τὸν δεδειγμένον ἐν τῷ ὄρει . . . leg. alleg.* III. 33 (I. p. 154), *κατὰ τὸ παράδειγμα τὸ δεδειγμένον σοι ἐν τῷ ὄρει πάντα ποιήσεις*.
- " 30, 15. Sept. *ἐλαττονήσει . . . quis r. d. h.* 39 (III. p. 42), *ἐλαττώσει*, which is the more usual form.
- " 30, 35. Sept. *ἐν αὐτῷ . . . ibid.* 41 (III. p. 44), *αὐτὸ*, and so also some codd. of the Sept.
- " 32, 42. Sept. *ὑπὸ τὸ ὕδωρ . . . de post Cain.* 46 (II. p. 42), *ἐπὶ τὸ ὕδωρ*, cf. **על-פני המים**, so also some codd. of the Sept.
- Levit. 2, 1. Sept. *δῶρον θυσίαν . . . de somn.* II. 10 (III. p. 281), *δῶρον ἢ θυσίαν*.
- " 2, 2. Sept. *δραξάμενος ἀπ' αὐτῆς . . . ibid.*, *ἀπ' αὐτῆς* is wanting.
- " 2, 2. Sept. *καὶ πάντα τὸν λίβανον, ibid.*, *σὸν . . . παντὶ τῷ λιβάνῳ*, cp. **על כל-לבנותה**.
- " 2, 2. Sept. *τὸ ἱερεὺς τὸ μνημόσυνον αὐτῆς . . . ibid.*, *ὁ ἱερεὺς* and *αὐτῆς* is wanting.
- " 5, 7. Sept. *κυρίῳ . . . mut. nom.* 41 (III. p. 205), is wanting.
- " 5, 11. Sept. *καὶ οἶσει τὸ δῶρον αὐτοῦ περὶ οὗ ἡμαρτε τὸ δέκατον τοῦ οἰφί σεμιδάλεως περὶ ἀμαρτίας· οὐκ ἐπιχεῖ . . . ibid.*, *καὶ — αὐτοῦ — περὶ οὗ ἡμαρτε — περὶ ἀμαρτίας* is wanting.

- Levit. 7, 34. Sept. Ἀαρὼν τῷ ἱερεῖ . . . *leg. alleg.* III. 46 (I. p. 162), τῷ ἱερεῖ is wanting.
- “ 14, 36. Sept. πρὸ τοῦ εἰς ἐλθόντα τὸν ἱερέα ἰδεῖν τὴν ἀφὴν . . . *quod deus immut.* 28 (II. p. 93), we read before ἰδεῖν—εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, as if the Hebrew read : **בְּטָרִם יָבֵא הַכֹּהֵן אֶל־הַכִּיֹּרֶת**, omitting τὴν ἀφὴν, and indeed some codd. of the Sept. read οἰκίαν instead of ἀφὴν.
- “ 19, 9. Sept. οὐ συντελέσετε τὸν θερισμὸν ὑμῶν τοῦ ἀγροῦ . . . *de somn.* II. 4 (III. p. 273), οὐ συντελέσετε τὸ λοιπὸν τοῦ θερισμοῦ, which expresses better the **פֶּאת שָׂדֶךְ**.
- “ 19, 12. Sept. τῷ ὀνόματί μου . . . *de spec. legg.* 7 (V. p. 120), ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου, cp. **בְּשֵׁמִי**.
- “ 19, 12. Sept. καὶ οὐ βεβηλώσετε τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ ὑμῶν . . . *ibid.*, καὶ τὸ ἐμὸν ὄνομα οὐ βεβηλώσετε, as if Philo had read **וְחָלַלְתָּם אֶת־שֵׁמִי**.
- “ 19, 23. Sept. ξύλον βρωσιμόν . . . *de plant.* 22 (II. p. 163), ξύλον βρώσεως = **עֵץ מֵאֵכָל**, although *ibid.* also as the Sept.
- “ 20, 18. Sept. καὶ ἀποκαλύψῃ τὴν ἀσχημοσύνην αὐτῆς . . . *de profug.* 34 (III. p. 150), is wanting.
- “ 27, 30. Sept. ἀπὸ τοῦ σπέρματος τῆς γῆς . . . *congr. erud. gr.* 18 (III. p. 90), τῆς γῆς is wanting.
- “ 27, 33. Sept. οὐδὲ πονηρὸν καλῶ . . . *de poster. Cain.* 27 (II. p. 25), is wanting, and so not only in the Hebrew but also in codd. of the Sept.
- Numb. 8, 24. Sept. εἰσελεύσονται . . . *quod. det. p̄ot. insid.* 19 (I. p. 286), εἰσελεύσεται = **יָבוֹא**.
- “ 8, 26. Sept. ἐν τῇ σκηνῇ τοῦ μαρτυρίου . . . *ibid.* is wanting.
- “ 10, 29. Sept. δεῦρο μεθ' ἡμῶν . . . *ebriet.* 10 (II. p. 191), ἔθι δὲ μεθ' ἡμῶν, more correct, cp. Hebr. **לִכְנָה אִתָּנוּ**.
- “ 11, 12. Sept. ἔτεκεν αὐτοὺς . . . *quis rer. d. h.* 5 (III. p. 8), αὐτὸν, cp. **יִלְדָּתִיהֶן**.
- “ 11, 16. Sept. οὓς αὐτοὺς σὺ οἶδας ὅτι οὐτοί εἰσι πρεσβύτεροι τοῦ λαοῦ . . . *sacrif. Ab. et Cain.* 22 (I. p. 250), αὐτὸς—ὅτι—τοῦ λαοῦ is wanting.
- “ 11, 23. Sept. γνώσῃ . . . *ibid.* 18 (I. p. 247), ὅψει, cp. Hebr. **תֵּרָאָה**.
- “ 12, 6. Sept. προφήτης ὑμῶν . . . *leg. alleg.* III. 33 (I. p. 154), ὑμῶν is wanting.
- “ 12, 6. Sept. ἐν ὁράματι αὐτῷ γνωσθήσομαι καὶ ἐν ὕπνῳ λαλήσω αὐτῷ . . . *ibid.*, ἐν ὁράματι αὐτῷ γνωσθήσεται καὶ ἐν σκιᾷ ὁ θεὸς οὐκ ἐναργῶς, as if the reading were

במראה אליו יתודע ובצלם אלהים. οὐκ
ἐναργῶς seems to be a gloss.

Numb. 14, 11. Sept. παροξύνει με . . . *migr. Abrah.* 12 (II. p. 307),
παροξύνουσιν, cp. the pl. ינאצני.

" 15, 19. Sept. ὑμεῖς . . . *de sacr. Abr. et C.* 33 (I. p. 258), is
wanting.

" 15, 19. Sept. ἀπὸ τῶν ἄρτων τῆς γῆς . . . *ibid.*, ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν
τῆς γῆς; perhaps the translator read: מפרי הארץ.

" 20, 17. Sept. ἐκ λάκκου . . . *quod deus immut.* 31 (II. p. 96),
ἐκ is wanting, cp. מי באר.

" 25, 4. Sept. αὐτοὺς . . . θυμοῦ . . . *de somn.* I. 15 (III. p. 232),
is wanting.

Deut. 6, 10. Sept. τῷ Ἀβραάμ καὶ τῷ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ τῷ Ἰακώβ . . . *de
profug.* 31 (III. p. 147), is wanting.

" 8, 12. Sept. ἐν αὐτοῖς . . . *de sacr. Abr. et C.* 14 (I. p. 243), is
wanting, and so also in Hebrew.

" 8, 13. Sept. καὶ ἀργυρίου . . . πληθυνθέντος σοι . . . *ibid.*, πληθ. σοι
is wanting.

" 8, 16. Sept. ὁ οὐκ ᾔδεις συ . . . *leg. alleg.* II. 21 (I. p. 113), is
wanting, as in the Hebrew.

" 8, 17. Sept. τὴν δύναμιν τὴν μεγάλην ταύτην . . . *de sacr. Abr. et
C.* 14 (I. p. 243), πᾶσαν τ. δ. ταύτην.

" 8, 18. Sept. καὶ μνησθήσῃ . . . *ibid.*, ἀλλὰ μνεία μνησθήσῃ. Did
he read זכור וזכרת?

" 10, 9. Sept. τοῖς Λευῖταις . . . *de plant.* 15 (II. p. 157), τῇ
φυλῇ Λεβί.

" 10, 9. Sept. ἐν τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς αὐτῶν . . . *ibid.*, ἐν νίοις Ἰσραὴλ.

" 10, 9. Sept. κληρὸς αὐτοῦ . . . *de somn.* 1, 25 (III. p. 248),
κλ. αὐτῷ.

" 12, 31. Sept. τὰς θυγατέρας αὐτῶν . . . *de Abr.* 33 (IV. p. 40),
αὐτῶν is wanting.

" 12, 31. Sept. κατακαίουσι ἐν πυρὶ . . . *ibid.*, ἐν πυρὶ is wanting.

" 14, 1. Sept. κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ . . . *de vict. offer.* 11 (IV. p. 353),
κυρίῳ τῷ θεῷ, cp. ליהוה א.

" 17, 15. Sept. καθιστῶν καταστήσεις . . . *creat. princ.* 2 (V. p. 154),
καθιστῶν is wanting.

" 19, 14. Sept. οἱ πατέρες σου . . . *de justit.* 3 (V. p. 150), οἱ
πρότεροί σου, which corresponds better to the ראשנים of
the Hebrew.

" 20, 1. Sept. φοβηθήσῃ ἀπ' αὐτῶν . . . *de agr.* 17 (II. p. 121),
ἀπ' αὐτῶν is wanting.

- Deut. 21, 21. Sept. αὐτοῦ ἐν λίθοις καὶ ἀποθανεῖται . . . *de ebriet.* 4 (II. p. 185), is wanting.
- " 23, 17. Sept. οὐκ ἔσται πόρνη ἀπὸ θυγατέρων Ἰσραὴλ . . . *migr. Abr.* 39 (III. p. 343), οὐκ ἂν γένοιτο πότε πόρνη τῶν τοῦ βλέποντος Ἰσραὴλ θυγατέρων, a citation and explanation.
- " 25, 15. Sept. ἵνα πολὺήμερος γένῃ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἧς κύριος ὁ θεὸς σου δίδωσί σοι ἐν κλήρῳ . . . *quis rer. div. h.* 33 (III. p. 37), ἵνα πληθυνθῶσιν αἱ ἡμέραι σου ἐπὶ τῆς χθονὸς ἣν κύριος ὁ θεὸς δίδωσί σοι κληροδοσίαν, cp. **רמען יאריכו ימך על-האדמה**.
- " 25, 16. Sept. πᾶς ποιῶν ταῦτα . . . *ibid.* is wanting.
- " 28, 23. Sept. καὶ ἔσται ὁ οὐρανὸς ὁ ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς σου χαλκοῦς καὶ ἡ γῆ ἡ ὑποκάτω σου σιδηρᾶ . . . *de exerc.* 2 (V. p. 247), θήσω γὰρ τὸν οὐρανὸν ὑμῶν χαλκοῦν καὶ τὴν γῆν σιδηρᾶν.
- " 34, 10. Sept. ἐν Ἰσραὴλ . . . *quis rer. d. h.* 52 (III. p. 58), is wanting.
- Josh. 1, 5. Sept. καὶ οὐκ ἐγκαταλείψω σε οὐδ' ὑπερόψομαί σε . . . better *de confus. ling.* 32 (II. p. 284), οὐ μὴ σε ἀνῶ οὐδ' οὐ μὴ σε ἐγκαταλίπω, **לא ארפך ולא-אעזבך**.
- Judg. 8, 9. Sept. εἶπε Γεδεὼν πρὸς ἄνδρας . . . *ibid.* 26 (II. p. 276), ὥμοσε γὰρ Γ. τοῖς ἄνδρασι, perhaps the reading was **יִישַׁבַּע** instead of **יֵאמֶר**, or it is a paraphrase.
- " 8, 9. Sept. ἐν ἐπιστροφῇ μου μετ' εἰρήνης . . . *ibid.*, ἐν τῷ με ἐποστρέφειν μετ' εἰρήνης, cp. **בשׁוּבִי בְשָׁלוֹם**.
- Job 14, 4. Sept. ἔσται . . . ἄλλ' οὐδεὶς . . . *mut. nom.* 6 (III. p. 166), is wanting.
- Jer. 2, 13. Sept. πηγὴν ὕδατος . . . *de profug.* 36 (III. p. 152), ὕδατος is wanting.
- " , 4. Sept. με ἐκάλεσας καὶ πατέρα καὶ ἀρχηγὸν τῆς παρθενίας σου . . . better *de cherub.* 14 (I. p. 210), ἄνδρα τῆς παρθενίας σου, cp. **אלוף נערי אתה**.
- " 15, 10. Sept. ἄνδρα δικαζόμενον καὶ διακρινόμενον . . . *conf. ling.* 12 (II. p. 258), ἄνθρωπον μάχης καὶ ἀηδίας, cp. **אִישׁ רִיב וְאִישׁ מִדּוּן**.
- " 15, 10. Sept. οὔτε ὠφέλησεν με οὐδεὶς . . . *ibid.*, οὐδέ ὠφέλησάν με, cp. **וְלֹא נִשְׂרִיבִי**.

Compare also Horneman, *Specimen exercitationum criticarum in versionem LXX. Interpretum ex Philone*, Gottingae, 1793; by the same, *Specimen secundum exercitationum*, etc., *ibid.*, 177, *b*. In the former, *de opificio mundi* and *Leg. allegor.* are compared with the Pentateuch; in the latter, Gen. i.-x. is compared with all of

Philo's writings. (Both works are reviewed in Michaelis, *Oriental. und. exeget. Bibliothek.*, Vol. IV., p. 161 sq.; Vol. IX., p. 54 sq.) Frankel, *Die Palestinische Exegese und Alexandrinische Hermeneutik*, pp. 190 sq.; Siegfried, *Philo und der überlieferte Text der Septuaginta*, in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, XVI., pp. 217 sq.; by the same, *Philo von Alexandria*, pp. 160 sq.

Notes.

*The Idea of Atonement, as found in the Piel verb
כָּפַר, the nouns כַּפָּרִים and כַּפֹּרֶת, etc.*

BY PROF. W. J. BEECHER, D.D.

THESE words are very often used in the Bible. The verb is commonly translated *make atonement*. This was done by the priest with the blood of the victims, in offerings of several kinds. The noun כַּפָּרִים is translated *atonement*, and כַּפֹּרֶת, *mercy seat*.

Physically, כָּפַר means to cover. It is therefore very commonly said that the idea of atonement or of expiation, in these words, is that of the covering of the offence of which one has been guilty, so that it will no longer be visible, and demand punishment.

In certain quarters a different explanation prevails, to the effect that in atonement, as expressed by these words, it is the offender, instead of the offence, that is covered from the eye of the judge.

Are not both these explanations wide of the mark? In Gen. xxxii. 21, Jacob, sending his present to Esau, is represented as saying: אֲכַפֵּרָה פָּנָיו, "Let me cover his face with the present going before me, and afterward I will see his face." Here it is the face of the offended Esau that is to be covered by the present, not Jacob the offender, nor Jacob's offence.

In 1 Sam. xii. 3, Samuel says: "And from whose hand have I taken כָּפָר, that I might hide my eyes with it (or at him)?" Here again the idea is that כָּפָר may hide, not the offence nor the offender, but the eyes of the judge.

It is analogous with this that the כָּפָר, or bitumen, of Noah's ark, kept the water from entering the ark, not by covering the sea, but by covering the ark. In like manner, so far as physical representation is concerned, the atonement expressed by כָּפַר keeps sin from presenting itself to the eye of the judge for punishment, not by covering the sin or the sinner, but by covering the eye of the judge.

John iii. 8.

BY PROF. J. F. GENUNG, PH.D.

IN the interpretation of this passage, commentators have always been predominantly, and as I think unduly, influenced by the fact that the Greek word *πνεῦμα* means both *spirit* and *wind*. As a consequence they have felt obliged to assume as unquestionable that the one meaning must be taken to illustrate the other ; that therefore the wind, in the characteristics here mentioned, must be supposed to illustrate the free unembodied spirit, which for this purpose is conceived of in a semi-materialistic light, as something coursing through the world, working mysteriously upon men, and giving impulses whose origin and tendency no one can understand. This interpretation also necessitates that the last clause of the verse should be twisted a little from its straightforward meaning ; so that what says plainly, "So is every one that is born of the Spirit" should be read, "So *it is with* every one that is born of the Spirit."

Now suppose that instead of this we take the passage just as it reads, and assume that the wind is an illustration of him who is born of the Spirit, or, what comes to the same thing, of the spiritual life in regenerate man. The life of the spiritually born is like the wind—how?

1. "The wind bloweth where it listeth." So far as we can see it is self-directive ; we can trace no power or mechanism moving it from without. So also the spiritual life has a freedom and a wisdom of its own, which, so far as an outsider can judge, is self-originated and self-guided. "Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty."

2 Corinthians iii. 17.

2. "And thou hearest the sound thereof." The reality and genuineness of the spiritual life, as of the wind, are palpable to every one, from its effects. But whom does our Lord mean here when he says, "*Thou* hearest"? The common interpretation takes *thou* to mean any one ; and so far as regards our relation to the wind, this is true. But I think that here it means any one not born of the Spirit ; and Nicodemus, to whom Jesus is speaking, is addressed as the type of such. Thou, who art unspiritual, hearest, perceivest the working, but canst not understand.

3. "But canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth." The same meaning of *thou* comes over from the preceding clauses :

no one can stand outside of the spiritual life and understand its origin and its tendency. It is all a mystery to the unregenerate. For this truth there are numerous parallel passages; see especially 1 Corinthians ii. 11, 14.

Here, however, we must make an adjustment with the common interpretation. As we now read it, the passage only says the unregenerate cannot judge the spiritual life; whereas it has always been understood to mean that no one, not even the regenerate man himself, can tell of the Spirit "whence it cometh, and whither it goeth." The question naturally rises therefore: If this is spoken only of the unregenerate, may not, on the other hand, the regenerate *know* the mystery of his spiritual life? I think a moment's consideration will make us hesitate to assert that he does not. We certainly understand this much, that our new life comes from God and tends to God; and such passages as 1 Corinthians ii. 10-16 ascribe much greater insight than this to the spiritual man. But I think also, the present passage implies the same in the antithesis, hitherto not sufficiently regarded, between *you* and *us*. As soon as He has said "thou hearest . . . but canst not tell whence and whither," and received Nicodemus's bewildered question, our Lord says, "*We* speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen; and *ye* receive not our testimony." Whom does He mean here by *we*? A great many conjectures have been made; but it seems to me perfectly clear that He is speaking for all who are born of the Spirit, whom He identifies with himself. We, who are of the kingdom of Heaven, can speak of heavenly things from knowledge; we know whence our spiritual life comes and whither it tends: ye, who are yet of the earth, cannot understand these things; they are only hearsay and wonder to you.

This whole passage then, from verse 5 to 11, is in large part a contrast between *you* — Nicodemus, and such as he — who are unspiritual, who cannot know, and *us* — Christ, and all who are his — to whom is made known the mystery of the kingdom of God. "He that is spiritual judgeth all things, yet he himself is judged of no man."

Some Typographical Errors in the Revised Version.

BY PROF. M. B. RIDDLE, D.D.

THE errors noted are those occurring in the standard royal octavo edition, copies of which were presented to subscribers. Others occur in the smaller editions, but these are found in all copies sent from England in 1881.

I. In Mark vi. 7 for *called* read *calleth*. The Greek verb is present, and was correctly rendered in the first (provisional) revision. In the second *called* occurs, and passed unnoticed on either side of the water. The discrepancy was first noticed by a member of the class of 1884 in Hartford Seminary.

II. Mark vi. 25. The margin "*Greek, the Baptizer,*" does not apply to verse 25, but only to verse 24 (comp. verse 15). The Greek word in verse 25 (so all authorities except L.) is βαπτιστοῦ. This blunder does not occur in the first or second revision, but appears in copies sent to America from England in 1880.

III. The most serious, and curious, blunder is found in the marginal note to Luke xv. 26. The Revised Version has "*Greek, bond-servants.*" The Greek word is παῖδων, while δούλους occurs in verse 22, with the above margin, as usual (see Revised Version *passim*).

This marginal note does not occur in either the first or the second English Revision, but in the former "*Greek, lads,*" occurs, and in the latter there is no marginal note. I would explain the presence of the incorrect note in this way: The English revisers added a number of marginal notes of this character after the second revision. The American revisers having objected to "*lad*" as a marginal rendering of παῖς, the word "*boy*" was substituted in the final revision. The proof-reader, finding "*boy*" and "*servant*" in such close relation, and noticing "*Greek, bond-servant*" in the margin of verse 22, supposed that was meant here. At all events, "*boy*" is the usual margin for παῖς elsewhere. Worst of all for human accuracy, is the fact that this error occurs in copies (sent to America in August, 1880) which passed under the careful inspection of all the revisers. It was, in fact, not detected until June, 1883, and then only because I was making a careful comparison of the work of the English and American companies.

IV. Among a number of inaccuracies in the American appendix the

most serious error is the insertion of "Col. i. 3" among the passages affected by the suggestion headed "XIII." A change of text, accepted by the revisers (omitting *καί* before *πατρί*, with Westcott and Hort), throws this instance outside the application of the principle. Our lamented Prof. Abbot, who prepared this note, followed Tischendorf's reading, to which the principle is applicable. He himself suggested many minor corrections in the American Appendix after it appeared in the Revised Version.

Μή interrogative.

BY REV. W. H. COBB.

It is well established that *μή* in questions expects the answer *no*; but how to derive this fact from the general use of *μή* as a *subjective* as well as negative particle is not commonly explained. I find that *μή* interrogative occurs in the N.T. only in *conversation*, actual or implied; but not in reflective or rhetorical questions, where "Shall I?" would stand in English (John xix. 15; 1 Cor. vi. 15), nor in questions as to matters of fact merely.

The subjective force it conveys belongs almost always to the other party, not to the speaker. Some such phrase as *τί δοκεῖ ὑμῖν* (*σοι*); may be understood before it, and what follows is supposed to be *not* (*μή*) the thought of the person or persons addressed. Instead of dropping the negative in translation, we may express it by the words "you do not think, suppose, claim," etc. *E.g.* in John iv. 12, the A.V. and R.V. render "Art thou greater than our father Jacob?" as though *μή* were absent. Were we to preserve the negative thus: "You are not greater than our father Jacob?" the question would still be objective. So in the redundant form employed in such cases by Winer and others, "You are not greater than our father Jacob, are you?" there is no clear mark of subjectivity. I call this redundant, because the speaker's tone gives the question sufficiently, both in Greek and in English. The true meaning I take to be, "You do not think you are greater than our father Jacob?" as though she had said, "What do you claim? *Not* — you are greater than Jacob?" *μή σὺ μείζων εἶ Ἰακώβ;* In the similar passage, John viii. 53, the Jews say to Jesus, "You do not think you are greater than Abraham?... *whom do you make yourself?*" In chap. iv. 33, the disciples are in conversation (*ἔλεγον πρὸς ἀλλήλους*), one saying to another, "You

don't suppose any one brought him food?" A similar note of mutual questioning (*εἰπον πρὸς ἑαυτούς*) occurs at chap. vii. 35, where the Jews say among themselves, "You don't think he is about to go to the Dispersion?" This seventh chapter of John contains several other examples. Verse 26 (see Meyer), "Perhaps the rulers do not really know that this is the Christ?" where the subjectivity inheres in *ἔγνωσαν*. Verse 31, many of the multitude *were saying*, "When the Christ cometh, you do not suppose he will do more signs?" Verse 41, "Why, you don't think the Christ is coming out of Galilee?" (*οὐ γάρ* would be, "No, for cometh the Christ out of Galilee?"). Verses 47, 48, "You too haven't been deceived [in your mind]? You don't suppose any one of the rulers believes on him?" Verse 51, "You wouldn't claim that our law judges a man without hearing?" Verse 52, "You too don't hail from Galilee?" In Paul's epistles a question is sometimes expressed before *μή* interrogative; in other cases it must be mentally supplied. Rom. iii. 5, "What shall we say? *Not* — God is unrighteous?" So ix. 14. Chap. iii. 3, "For what is the case? *Not* that their want of faith," etc. When *μή* is followed by *οὐ*, the latter negatives the verb only (so Winer), while *μή* still retains its subjective force. 1 Cor. ix. 4, 5, "You do not claim that we have no right to eat and drink, to lead about a wife that is a believer?" 1 Cor. xi. 22, "Why, you do not mean to say you have no houses for eating and drinking?" The double form of the question here and at chap. ix. 8, 9, is no valid objection. See Meyer on these passages.

The only clear case where *μή* refers to the speaker's own impression is John xxi. 5, "Children, ye have no meat, I suppose?" Sometimes the subjectivity is in the sphere of volition or feeling rather than thought. John vi. 67, "You too do not mean to go away?" Luke xxii. 35, "You did not feel the lack of anything?" Acts vii. 28, "You do not intend to kill me?" (from LXX).

The difference between the subjective and objective negation is well seen at Luke vi. 39, where both occur: "You do not suppose a blind man can lead a blind man? will they not (*οὐχί*, as matter of fact) both fall into a ditch?"

Proceedings.

HARTFORD, June, 1884.

THE ninth meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis was held at the Theological Seminary in Hartford, Conn., commencing at 3 P.M., June 12, 1884.

In the absence of the President, Dr. Ward was called to the chair.

The Committee of Arrangements reported a programme setting apart the evening session for business, notes, and other miscellaneous matters.

The President here arrived and took the chair.

On motion a committee, consisting of Drs. Toy, Gardiner, and Ward, was appointed to prepare a minute relative to the death of Prof. Abbot.

The Society then proceeded to the consideration of the papers prepared for the occasion.

Prof. Hartranft asked to be excused from presenting his paper at this meeting.

The first paper read was that of Dr. Harwood on "Σωτηρία and its Cognates," which was followed by some discussion.

At this point Profs. Brown, Lyon, and Hartranft were appointed a committee to nominate officers for the ensuing year.

The second paper was that by Prof. Beecher on "The Literary Form of the Biblical History of the Times of the Judges," in the discussion of which various members took part.

The third paper, on "The Order of the Graces, Gal. v. 22 and 23," was by the Rev. Mr. Cobb.

After the discussion of this paper, the Society, having been invited by the Committee of Arrangements to take tea at the Seminary, at 6 o'clock took a recess until 7.30 in the evening.

Upon reassembling, the Nominating Committee reported the following list of officers:—

President, Prof. Goodwin.

Secretary, Prof. Mitchell.

Vice-President, Prof. Bissell.

Treasurer, Prof. Beecher.

Councillors, Profs. Briggs, Day, Dwight, Short, and Toy.

They were unanimously elected.

The council thereupon recommended the following persons as candidates for membership in the Society : —

Rev. A. A. Wright,	Boston, Mass.
Rev. H. M. Denslow,	Rutland, Vt.
Prof. H. M. Harman,	Carlisle, Penn.
Rev. H. Loomis,	Stoneham, Mass.
Rev. S. S. Kohn,	Boston, Mass.
Prof. M. D. Buell,	Boston, Mass.
Rev. J. H. Coit,	Concord, N.H.
Rev. Thomas Laurie,	Providence, R.I.
Rev. G. S. Burroughs,	New Britain, Conn.
Prof. J. S. Riggs,	Auburn, N.Y.
Rev. Graham Taylor,	Hartford, Conn.
Prof. Llewellyn Pratt,	Hartford, Conn.
Rev. G. F. Genung,	Amherst, Mass.
Prof. T. P. Field,	Amherst, Mass.
Rev. R. S. Green,	Buffalo, N.Y.

They were all elected.

The council here recommended that the next meeting be held in New York during the Christmas holidays, the time and place to be more definitely fixed by a committee consisting of Profs. Francis Brown and Briggs and Mr. Riggs.

The council also asked the Society to provide for the publication of the Constitutions and By-Laws, with a list of members, for distribution, especially to new members. The discussion upon this suggestion gave rise to a motion that a committee be appointed to revise the Constitution and By-Laws, and report before the close of the meeting. The motion was carried, and Profs. Gardiner, Francis Brown, and Mitchell were appointed a committee for this purpose.

The Treasurer next presented his report, which was duly referred to an Auditing Committee consisting of Profs. Toy and Bissell.

A recess of ten minutes was then taken.

After the recess the committee appointed to prepare a minute on the death of Prof. Abbot made the following report : —

“The Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis desires to put upon record its deep sorrow at the death of Ezra Abbot, one of the founders of the Society, constant in his devotion to its interests, a scholar whose contributions added not only to the value of the Society's work, but also to the resources of New Testament study

throughout the world, a man whose purity and nobleness won him the love of all his fellow-members."

It was moved that the minute be adopted and a copy of it transmitted to Mrs. Abbot. Dr. Gardiner seconded the motion in a feeling tribute to the memory of the deceased. Similar remarks were made by Drs. Riddle, Goodwin, Ward, Toy, and Bissell. The minute was finally adopted by a rising vote.

The Secretary then called the names of the members present, that any one having a note might have an opportunity to present it. The following were thus elicited : —

One from Prof. Beecher on **נפר** and its derivatives.

Prof. Genung read one on John iii. 8.

Prof. Riddle mentioned several mistakes of the Revisers of the New Testament.

The committee appointed to revise the Constitution and By-Laws next reported a few changes, some of which were adopted. The subject was, however, finally recommitted.

It was voted that the Secretary be authorized to publish, at his discretion, not to exceed five hundred copies of the Constitution and By-Laws, when revised, with a list of members and the necessary information concerning the price of the *Journal*.

At 10 P.M. the Society adjourned.

At 9 A.M. on the following day the Society reassembled, and proceeded at once to consider a new draft of the Constitution and By-Laws which had been prepared by the committee. The result of these deliberations was the adoption of the following : —

CONSTITUTION.

I.

THIS association shall be called "The Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis."

II.

The object of the Society shall be to stimulate the critical study of the Scriptures by presenting, discussing, and publishing original papers on biblical topics.

III.

The officers of the Society shall be a President, a Vice-President, a Secretary, and a Treasurer, all of whom, and five others constitut-

ing with them a Council, shall be elected annually, and hold office until their successors are appointed.

IV.

Members shall be elected by the Society upon the recommendation of the Council.

V.

The Society shall meet at least twice a year, at such times and places as the Council may determine.

BY-LAWS.

I.

It shall be the duty of the President, or, in his absence, of the Vice-President, to preside at all the meetings of the Society ; but, in the absence of both of these officers, the Society may choose a presiding officer from the members present.

II.

It shall be the duty of the Secretary to notify the members, at least two weeks in advance, of each meeting ; to keep a record of the proceedings of such meetings ; and from time to time, at the discretion of the Council, to superintend the publications of the Society.

III.

It shall be the duty of the Treasurer to take charge of all the funds of the Society, and to invest or disburse them under the direction of the Council, rendering an account of all his transactions to the Society at each annual meeting.

IV.

It shall be the duty of the Council to propose candidates for membership ; to fix the times and places for meetings ; to recommend papers for presentation at each meeting ; to select the papers to be published in the *Journal*, and generally to supervise the interests of the Society.

V.

The fee for admission into the Society shall be five dollars, besides which each member shall annually pay a tax of three dollars ; but libraries may become members without the fee for admission, and a donation at one time by a single person of fifty dollars shall exempt the donor from all further payments.

VI.

Each member, in consideration of the annual tax, shall be entitled to receive, without additional charge, one copy of each publication of the Society after his election, in addition to which, if he be a contributor to the *Journal*, he shall receive twenty-five copies of any article or articles which he may have contributed.

VII.

Twelve members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, but a smaller number may continue in session for the purpose of hearing and discussing papers presented.

The following resolution, supplementary of the By-Laws, with reference to the price at which members may procure extra copies of the *Journal*, was adopted:—

Resolved: That the Secretary be authorized to furnish to members *for the purpose of presentation*, additional copies of any volume of the *Journal*, to the number of ten, at the rate of \$1 a copy, but that the price to persons not members be the amount of the annual assessment.

At the conclusion of these matters of business the fourth paper, by Prof. Toy, on "The Millennium of the Apocalypse," was read and discussed.

The fifth paper, on "1 Sam. i.-xv. in Lagarde's Septuagint," by Prof. Smith, was cut short to give time for the sixth, by Prof. Genung, on "The Righteousness which is by Faith, Rom. x. 4-1."

There were present at one or more of the sessions, the following members: Messrs. Andrews, Beckwith, Beecher, Bissell, Francis Brown, Buell, Burroughs, Cobb, Ferguson, Gardiner, Genung, Goodwin, Hart, Hartranft, Lyon, McCook, Micou, Mitchell, Nordell, Peters, Pratt, Riddle, Smith, Streibert, Graham Taylor, and Ward.

The rough minutes were read and corrected.

The Society adjourned at 12 M.

H. G. MITCHELL,

Secretary.

NEW YORK, December, 1884.

The tenth meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis was held at the Union Theological Seminary in New York, on the 30th of December, 1884.

The Society was called to order by the President at 2.40 P.M.

In the absence of the Secretary, Prof. Francis Brown was chosen Secretary *pro tem*.

The minutes of the last meeting were read and approved.

The Committee of Arrangements reported that it had been thought best to hold three sessions: one in the afternoon, a second in the evening, and a third on the following morning. They also recommended that miscellaneous business be made the first order for the second session, and that it be followed by the notes to be presented, the first and last sessions being devoted to the papers and their discussion. The report was adopted.

Since the authors of several papers were absent, it was decided that the reading of the papers begin with the first on the programme whose author was present.

Dr. Hall then exhibited and described "A Recently Discovered Syriac Ms.," owned by R. S. Williams, Esq., of Utica, N.Y.

A paper on "The Date of the Epistle to the Galatians, and Certain Passages in the First Epistle to the Corinthians," by Prof. Warfield, was next, in the absence of the author, read by the Secretary.

Hereupon the order was changed, and opportunity given for presenting notes.

Dr. Hall called attention to an Arabic-French dictionary, published by the Jesuits at Beyrout, 1883.

Prof. Day spoke on the Scandinavian translations of the Bible. He was followed by Prof. Schaff, on the same subject.

Dr. Hall presented a second note on variations in the same edition of certain Greek New Testaments.

At this point, on motion of the Committee of Arrangements, the the Society voted that the recess, when taken, last from 5.30 to 8 o'clock.

Prof. Peters then presented two notes, the first on Isa. iii. 18 f., and the second on Isa. v. 1.

Prof. Bissell referred to his articles on the Laws of the Pentateuch, and to the need of scholarly Old-Testament work. Profs. Briggs, Harper, and Day contributed some comments on the latter of these subjects.

A recess was then taken until 8 o'clock.

When the Society re-assembled in the evening, Dr. Crosby took the chair until the President, who was attending a meeting of the Council, should be at liberty.

On motion, miscellaneous business was postponed until the return of the Council.

Meanwhile Dr. Hall presented an additional note on Wright's "Empire of the Hittites."

At this point, the President resumed the chair, and the Society proceeded to the transaction of business. The following persons were recommended to membership :—

Rev. Roderic Terry,	New York, N.Y.
Prof. H. N. Gardiner,	Northampton, Mass.
Prof. R. D. Wilson,	Allegheny, Penn.
Rev. E. C. Richardson,	Hartford, Conn.
Rev. A. McClenahan,	New York, N.Y.
Prof. E. T. Bartlett,	Philadelphia, Penn.
Prof. J. F. Garrison,	Philadelphia, Penn.
Rev. Arthur Brooks,	New York, N.Y.
Rev. Frank Draper,	New York, N.Y.
Prof. J. Rendell Harris,	Baltimore, Md.
Prof. Sylvester Burnham,	Hamilton, N.Y.
Prof. F. B. Denio,	Bangor, Me.
Prof. T. J. Dodd,	Nashville, Tenn.
Prof. R. V. Foster,	Lebanon, Tenn.
Prof. C. R. Hemphill,	Columbia, S.C.
Prof. J. P. Landis,	Dayton, O.
Prof. J. G. Lansing,	New Brunswick, N.J.
Prof. B. Manly,	Louisville, Ky.
Prof. W. W. Moore,	Hampden-Sidney, Va.
Prof. David Paul,	New Concord, O.
Prof. G. W. Riggan,	Louisville, Ky.
Prof. W. O. Sproull,	Cincinnati, O.
Prof. B. C. Taylor,	Chester, Penn.
Prof. F. H. Foster,	Oberlin, O.

All these were elected members.

The presentation of notes was then resumed.

Dr. Crosby discussed *ἐξουσία*, 1 Cor. xi. 10.

Dr. Hall exhibited a cast of the Nebuchadnezzar Cylinder in the Metropolitan Museum at New York, and called attention to Francke's "Altes Testament im Johannes-Evangelium."

Two additional notes were read by the Secretary: one on "Colonization in Samaria, under the Sargonidae," by Prof. Lyon; the other on "M^y Interrogative," by Mr. Cobb.

The Society now voted to omit the third session, recommended by the Committee of Arrangements, and leave the rest of the papers, whose authors were not present, until the next meeting.

The rough minutes were read and corrected.

There were present at one or both of the sessions the following members:—

Messrs. Beecher, Bissell, Briggs, Francis Brown, C. R. Brown, Chambers, Crosby, Day, H. N. Gardiner, Genung, Gillett, Goodwin, Hall, Harper, Hincks, Jewett, Lansing, Peters, Rice, Schaff, Stevens, Terry, and Woodruff.

Adjourned.

FRANCIS BROWN,

Secretary pro tem.

OFFICERS.

PROF. D. R. GOODWIN, D.D., LL.D., *President.*

“ E. C. BISSELL, D.D., *Vice-President.*

“ H. G. MITCHELL, Ph.D., *Secretary.*

“ W. J. BEECHER, D.D., *Treasurer.*

LIST OF MEMBERS.

The Members are requested to give the Secretary notice of changes in their addresses.

Rev. S. J. Andrews,	Hartford, Conn.
Rt. Rev. M. S. Baldwin, D.D.,	London, Ont.
Prof. W. G. Ballantine, M.A.,	Oberlin, O.
“ E. T. Bartlett, M.A.,	50th St., Philadelphia, Penn.
Pres. S. C. Bartlett, D.D., LL.D.,	Hanover, N.H.
Prof. I. T. Beckwith, Ph.D.,	Hartford, Conn.
“ Willis J. Beecher, D.D.,	Auburn, N.Y.
“ John Binney,	Middletown, Conn.
“ E. C. Bissell, D.D.,	Hartford, Conn.
“ C. A. Briggs, D.D.,	Union Theol. Sem., New York, N.Y.
Rev. Arthur Brooks,	209 Madison Ave., New York, N.Y.
Prof. C. R. Brown,	Newton Centre, Mass.
“ Francis Brown, D.D.,	Union Theol. Sem., New York, N.Y.
“ M. D. Buell, M.A.,	12 Somerset Street, Boston, Mass.
“ Sylvester Burnham, D.D.,	Hamilton, N.Y.
Rev. G. S. Burroughs, Ph.D.,	New Britain, Conn.

- Prof. E. D. Burton, Newton Centre, Mass.
 " H. A. Buttz, D.D., LL.D., Madison, N.J.
 Rev. T. W. Chambers, D.D., LL.D., 70 West 36th St., New York, N.Y.
 Pres. Thomas Chase, LL.D., Haverford Coll., Montgomery Co., Penn.
 Rev. W. H. Cobb, Uxbridge, Mass.
 " J. H. Coit, M.A., Concord, N.H.
 " Howard Crosby, D.D., LL.D., 116 East 19th St., New York, N.Y.
 " E. R. Craven, D.D., Newark, N.J.
 Prof. E. L. Curtis, 1060 North Halsted St., Chicago, Ill.
 " S. I. Curtis, D.D., 364 Washington Boul'v'd, Chicago, Ill.
 " G. E. Day, D.D., New Haven, Conn.
 " F. B. Denio, M.A., Bangor, Me.
 Rev. H. M. Denslow, Seneca Falls, N.Y.
 Prof. John De Witt, D.D., New Brunswick, N.J.
 " T. G. Dodd, D.D., Nashville, Tenn.
 Rev. Frank Draper, M.A., 349 West 92d St., New York, N.Y.
 Prof. Timothy Dwight, D.D., New Haven, Conn.
 " Ll. J. Evans, D.D., Lane Theol. Sem., Cincinnati, O.
 " Henry Ferguson, Hartford, Conn.
 " T. P. Field, D.D., Amherst, Mass.
 " R. V. Foster, Lebanon, Tenn.
 " Frederic Gardiner, D.D., Middletown, Conn.
 " H. N. Gardiner, M.A., Northampton, Mass.
 " J. F. Garrison, D.D., Camden, N.J.
 " F. A. Gast, D.D., Lancaster, Penn.
 " J. F. Genung, Ph.D., Amherst, Mass.
 Rev. C. R. Gillett, M.A., Union Theol. Sem., New York, N.Y.
 Prof. D. R. Goodwin, D.D., LL.D., 3927 Locust St., Philadelphia, Penn.
 Rev. E. P. Gould, M.A., Burlington, Vt.
 " R. S. Green, D.D., Buffalo, N.Y.
 Prof. I. H. Hall, Ph.D., 2 East 86th St., New York, N.Y.
 " H. M. Harman, D.D., Carlisle, Penn.
 " W. R. Harper, Ph.D., Morgan Park, Ill.
 " Samuel Hart, D.D., Hartford, Conn.
 " C. D. Hartranft, D.D., Hartford, Conn.
 Rev. E. Harwood, D.D., New Haven, Conn.
 " C. R. Hemphill, Louisville, Ky.
 " F. A. Henry, Ridgefield, Conn.
 " F. G. Hibbard, D.D., Clifton Springs, N.Y.
 Prof. E. Y. Hincks, D.D., Andover, Mass.
 " R. D. Hitchcock, D.D., LL.D., Union Theol. Sem., New York, N.Y.
 " A. B. Hyde, D.D., Denver, Col.
 Rev. S. M. Jackson, M.A., 14 East 31st St., New York, N.Y.
 " E. H. Jewett, D.D., Norwich, Conn.
 " S. S. Kohn, Ph.D., Boston, Mass.

Prof. G. T. Ladd, D.D.,	New Haven, Conn.
“ J. P. Landis, D.D.,	Dayton, O.
“ J. G. Lansing, D.D.,	New Brunswick, N.J.
Rev. J. W. Lindsay, D.D.,	West Newton, Mass.
“ H. Loomis, D.D.,	Stoneham, Mass.
Prof. D. G. Lyon, Ph.D.,	Lowell St., Cambridge, Mass.
Rev. J. J. McCook,	Hartford, Conn.
“ C. M. Mead, Ph.D.,	Berlin, Germany.
“ Selah Merrill, D.D.,	Jerusalem, Syria.
“ R. W. Micou,	Waterbury, Conn.
Prof. H. G. Mitchell, Ph.D.,	12 Somerset St., Boston, Mass.
Rev. J. I. Mombert, D.D.,	Paterson, N.J.
Prof. G. F. Moore, M.A.,	Andover, Mass.
“ W. W. Moore, D.D.,	Hampden-Sidney, Va.
Rev. P. A. Nordell,	New London, Conn.
Prof. Howard Osgood, D.D.,	Rochester, N.Y.
“ J. A. Paine, Ph.D.,	Tarrytown, N.Y.
“ J. P. Peters, Ph.D.,	4408 Chestnut St., Philadelphia, Penn.
Rev. Bernard Pick, Ph.D.,	Allegheny, Penn.
Prof. Llewellyn Pratt, D.D.,	Hartford, Conn.
“ George Prentice, D.D.,	Middletown, Conn.
Rev. Edwin W. Rice, D.D.,	1122 Chestnut St., Philadelphia, Penn.
Prof. T. H. Rich, D.D.,	Lewiston, Me.
Rev. E. C. Richardson,	Hartford, Conn.
Prof. M. B. Riddle, D.D.,	Hartford, Conn.
“ G. W. Riggan, D.D.,*	Louisville, Ky.
Rev. J. F. Riggs, M.A.,	Cranford, N.J.
Prof. J. S. Riggs, M.A.,	Auburn, N.Y.
“ C. J. H. Ropes,	Bangor, Me.
“ Philip Schaff, D.D., LL.D.,	42 Bible House, New York, N.Y.
“ G. H. Schodde, Ph.D.,	Columbus, O.
“ H. M. Scott, B.D.,	520 Adams St., Chicago, Ill.
“ Charles Short, LL.D.,	24 West 60th St., New York, N.Y.
“ H. P. Smith, D.D.,	Lane Theol. Sem., Cincinnati, O.
Rev. Newman Smyth, D.D.,	New Haven, Conn.
Prof. W. O. Sproull, Ph.D.,	Cincinnati, O.
“ O. S. Stearns, D.D.,	Newton Centre, Mass.
Rev. R. P. Stebbins, D.D.,	Newton Centre, Mass.
Prof. P. H. Steenstra, D.D.,	Cambridge, Mass.
“ W. A. Stevens, D.D., LL.D.,	Rochester, N.Y.
Rev. Jacob Streibert,	West Haven, Conn.
Prof. James Strong, D.D., LL.D.,	Madison, N.J.
Rev. Graham Taylor,	Hartford, Conn.
Prof. B. C. Taylor, M.A.,	Chester, Penn.

* Died April 18, 1885.

Prof. J. P. Taylor, M.A.,	Andover, Mass.
Rev. W. M. Taylor, D.D.,	5 West 35th St., New York, N.Y.
Prof. M. S. Terry, D.D.,	Evanston, Ill.
Rev. Roderic Terry, D.D.,	169 Madison Ave, New York, N.Y.
Prof. J. H. Thayer, D.D.,	Cambridge, Mass.
Rev. H. C. Thomson,	San Luis Potosi, Mexico.
“ J. E. Todd, D.D.,	New Haven, Conn.
Prof. C. H. Toy, D.D., LL.D.,	Lowell St., Cambridge, Mass.
Rev. W. H. Ward, D.D., LL.D.,	<i>The Independent</i> , New York, N.Y.
Prof. B. B. Warfield, D.D.,	Allegheny, Penn.
“ R. F. Weidner,	Rock Island, Ill.
“ H. G. Weston, D.D.,	Chester, Penn.
“ R. D. Wilson, M.A.,	Allegheny, Penn.
“ F. E. Woodruff, M.A.,	Andover, Mass.
Rev. A. A. Wright, M.A.,	Boston, Mass.

SUBSCRIBERS TO THE JOURNAL.

Andover Theological Seminary,	Andover, Mass.
Berkeley Divinity School,	Middletown, Conn.
Boston Public Library,	Boston, Mass.
Divinity School of the Prot. Epis.	
Church,	Philadelphia, Penn.
Harvard College,	Cambridge, Mass.
Newton Theological Institution,	Newton Centre, Mass.
Union Theological Seminary,	New York, N.Y.
Wesleyan University,	Middletown, Conn.
Rev. C. E. Thompson,	25 Henrietta St., Covent Garden,
	London, England.

BS
410
J7
v.3-4

Journal of Biblical
literature

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY
